The Syriac Version of the Liturgy of St James

Gorgias Liturgical Studies

47

This series is intended to provide a venue for studies about liturgies as well as books containing various liturgies. Making liturgical studies available to those who wish to learn more about their own worship and practice or about the traditions of other religious groups, this series includes works on service music, the daily offices, services for special occasions, and the sacraments.

The Syriac Version of the Liturgy of St James

A brief history for Students

Baby Varghese

gorgias press

2009

Gorgias Press LLC, 180 Centennial Ave., Piscataway, NJ, 08854, USA

www.gorgiaspress.com

Copyright © 2009 by Gorgias Press LLC

Originally published in

All rights reserved under International and Pan-American Copyright Conventions. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning or otherwise without the prior written permission of Gorgias Press LLC.

2009 ,

ISBN 978-1-60724-398-4 **ISSN 1937-3252**

Published first in the U.K. by Grove Books, 2001.

Printed in the United States of America

Contents

Abbreviations and works cited. 3

Introduction: The Anaphora of St James 5

1. Introductory Prayers 11
2. The Anaphora 21
3. Intercessions 38
4. Preparation for the Communion 40
5. Communion and Post-communion 48
6. Conclusion 54

AC = *The Apostolic Constitutions*. Marcel Metzger (ed), *Les Constitutions Apostoliques*, t.I: livres I-II (SC 320) (Paris, 1985); t.II: livres III-IV (SC 329) (Paris, 1986); t.III: livres VII-VIII (SC 336) (Paris, 1987). Eng.tr. W.Jardine Grisbrooke, *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions: A Text for Students* (Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 13-14, 1990).

APSyr = A.Raes (ed) *The Syriac Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles*, **AS I-I** (1939) 203-227.

AS I-III = *Anaphorae Syriace*, vols.I-III (Rome, 1939-)

ATim = A.Rücker (ed) *The Syriac Anaphora of Timothy of Alexandria*, in **AS I-1** (1939) 3-47.

Bar Hebraeus, *Nomocanon* = P.Bedjan (ed), *Nomocanon Gregori Barhebraei* (Paris, 1898)

Baumstark, *Denkmäler*, A.Baumstark, 'Denkmäler altarmenischer Messliturgie. 3 Die armenische Rezension der Jakobusliturgie' in *Oriens Christianus* II, 7/8 (1918), 1-32.

Berlin, Sachau = Eduard Sachau, *Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, Aby. 1-2, Berlin, 1899 (= *Die Handschriften Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin, 23).*

Brightman = F.E.Brightman (ed), *Liturgies Eastern and Western: 1 Eastern* (Oxford, 1896)

Brock, *Commentary* = S.Brock, 'An Early Syriac Commentary on the Liturgy' in *The Journal of Theological Studies* - NS 37 (1986), 387-403.

Connolly, *Book of Life* = R.H.Connolly, 'The Book of Life' in *The Journal of Theological Studies* 13 (1912), 580-594.

Connolly, *Narsai* = *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai, translated into English with an Introduction* by R.H.Connolly, (Texts and Studies VIII.1, Cambridge, 1909).

Connolly, *St James* = 'The Anaphora of the Holy Mar Jacob, Brother of Our Lord and Bishop of Jerusalem' in Connolly-Codrington, 87-114 (Syr); 91-111 (Eng).

Connolly-Codrington = *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy by George, Bishop of the Arab Tribes and Moses Bar Kepha, together with the Syriac Anaphora of St James and a document entitled* 'The Book of Life'. *Text and English translation* by R.H. Connolly and H.W.Codrington (London, 1913).

Conybeare-Wadrop = F.C.Conybeare and O.Wadrop, 'The Georgian Version of the Liturgy of St James' in *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 18 (1913), 396-410; 19(1914), 155-173.

DbS = Dionysius Bar Salibi: *Commentary on the Eucharist, translated into English* by B. Varghese (Môrân 'Ethô-10, Kottayam, 1998).

Euringer = S.Euringer, 'Die Anaphora des hl.Jacobus des Bruders der Herr' in *Oriens Christianus* II, 4 (1915) 1-19.

Fenwick, *Basil and James* = John R.K.Fenwick, *The Anaphora of Saint Basil and Saint James* (OCA 240, Rome, 1992).

Fenwick, *Fourth Century* = *Id., Fourth Century Anaphoral Construction Techniques* (Grove Liturgical Studies 45, 1986).

George of the Arabs, *Com.* = *An Exposition of the Mysteries of the Church made by a Certain bishop named George*, in Connolly-Codrington,11-23.

GrJ = The Greek version of St James.

Heiming = O.Heiming (ed), *Anaphora syriaca sancti Jacobi fratris Domini*, **AS.II-2** (1953), 109-179.

Jasper-Cuming = R.C.D.Jasper and G.J.Cuming (eds), *Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1990; 3rd ed)

JEGS = *Jacob of Edessa's Commentary on the Eucharist addressed to George, the Stylite of Serugh* (unpublished Syriac Manuscript, Berlin, Sachau 218, fol.178v-186v).[1]

JETh = Jacob of Edessa, *Letter to the Presbyter Thomas*, in **DbS** 3:1-10. Also: J.S.Assemani, *Bibliotheca Orientalis* I, (Rome, 1719) 479-486; Brightman, 490-494.

John of Dara = John of Dara, *Commentary on the Eucharist*, translated into English by B.Varghese (Môrân 'Ethô-12, Kottayam, 1999).

Khouri-Sarkis, *St.Jacques* = G.Khouri-Sarkis, 'L'anaphore syriaque de Saint Jacques' in **OS** IV (1959), 385-448.

Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes* = 'Notes sur l'anaphore syriaque de Saint Jacques' in **OS** V (1960) 1-32; 129-158; 363-384; VII (1962) 277-296; VIII (1963) 3-20.

1 This was written in 1838, most probably copied from an ancient text. The same text is found in Vatican Syriac 159 (not consulted). Cf Rücker, xxiii-xxiv. An English translation is forthcoming.

MbK = *The Exposition of Moses Bar Kepha, that is, the Explanation of the Mysteries of the Oblation* in Connolly-Codrington, 24-90 (Eng.tr).

MC = Cyril of Jerusalem, *The Mystagogical Catecheses* = A.Peidagnel (ed) and P.Paris (tr), *Cyrille de Jérusalem, Catéchèses mystagogiques*, (SC 126bis, Paris, 1988). Eng.trans. by H.G.Gifford, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, Second Series, Vol.VII (1955).

Mercier = B.C.Mercier (ed), *La Liturgie de S.Jacques*, PO XXVI/2 (Paris, 1946) 121-249.

NCR = 'The new and Correct Recension of Syriac Saint James' attributed to Jacob of Edessa.

OS = *L'Orient Syrien* (Paris, 1956-1967).

OSV = The Old Syriac Version (of Saint James).

Rahmani, *I Fasti* = I.E.Rahmani, *I Fasti della Chiesa Patriarcale Antiochena* (Rome, 1920).

Rahmani, *Liturgies* = *Id.*, *Les liturgies orientales et occidentales* (Beyrouth, 1929).

Rücker = A.Rücker, *Die syrische Jakobusanaphora nach der Rezension des Jaquob(h) von Edessa*, LF 4 (Muster-Westfalen, 1913).

Sauget = J.M.Sauget, 'Vestiges d'une célébration gréco-syriaque de l'anaphore de Saint Jacques' in C.Laga *et als* (ed), *After Chalcedon: Studies in Theology and Church History offered to Prof.Albert van Roey for his 70th Birthday* (Louvain, 1985) 309-345.

Severus, *Letters* = E.E.Brooks (ed), *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch* (Patrologia Orientalis, XIV-1).

Severus, *Select Letters* = E.W.Brooks (ed), *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch*, 2 Vols. (London-Oxford, 1904).

Synodicon = A.Vööbus (ed and tr), *The Synodicon in the West Syrian Tradition* 2 Vols. (Vol.I, CSCO 367-368; Vol.II, CSCO 375-376, Louvain, 1975-1976).

SyJ = The Syriac version of Saint James.

TD = I.Rahmani (ed), *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi* (Mainz, 1899). Eng.tr G.Sperry-White, *The Testamentum Domini: A Text for Students* (Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 19, 1991).

Tarby = A.Tarby, *La prière eucharistique de l'église de Jérusalem* (Théologie Historique 17, Paris, 1972).

Theodore, *Eucharist* = A.Mingana (ed), *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and the Eucharist* (Woodbrook Studies VI, Cambridge, 1933).

Witvliet = John D. Witvliet, 'The Anaphora of Saint James' in Paul F. Bradshaw (ed), *Essays on Early Eastern Eucharistic Prayers* (Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1997), 153-172.

Introduction: The Anaphora of St James

The anaphora of St James is perhaps the most widely circulated Eastern anaphora in the whole history of Christianity. Being the liturgy of Jerusalem, its authorship has traditionally been attributed to 'Saint James, the first bishop of Jerusalem and the brother of the Lord'. Though the present structure belongs to a later period, the core of the anaphora undoubtedly goes back to the fourth or early fifth century.[2] Recently John Fenwick has suggested that the Jerusalem redaction is in fact a conflation of Palestinian sources with an early form of the anaphora of Saint Basil.[3]

The anaphora of St James has come down to us in Greek[4], Syriac, Georgian[5], Armenian[6], Ethiopian[7] and the Old Slavonic versions[8]. But Greek and Syriac are the most important versions and others are derived from them.

The Patriarchate of Antioch was probably the first to adopt the anaphora of Jerusalem, adding liturgical elements that were apparently missing in the original text.[9] Fenwick has suggested a derivation from an earlier form of St Basil. However, the exact origin of these elements is an open question. It has been assumed that the antiochene version of St James was made some time before the definite separation between the Chalcedonians and the non-Chalcedonians. The earliest possible date of this conflation is the first half of the fifth century.

In the course of history, when the liturgical centres of Jerusalem and Antioch lost their prominence and imperial Constantinople became the religious capital of Byzantine Christianity, St James lost its former popularity among the Byzantines.[10] It was replaced by 'the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom', the official anaphora of Constantinople. However, St James continued to be used among the Byzantines until the end of the twelfth century.[11] The Greeks of the Island of Zante and Jerusalem continued to use it once a year on 23 October, the Feast of St James. By 1900, Jerusalem had abandoned this practice, but then Patriarch Damien made attempts to revive it and for a few years celebrated on the Sunday after Christmas.[12] Now only the Churches of the West Syrian tradition celebrate St James liturgy.

2 Tarby, 26; Khouri-Sarkis, *S Jacques*, 390-405.
3 Fenwick, *Basil and James; Fourth Century*. For a critical evaluation of Fenwick's theory see Witvliet, 153-172.
4 Critical edition by Mercier. Eng.tr. Jasper-Cuming, 89-99.
5 Cf Conybeare-Wadrop; Tarby, 38-40.
6 Baumstark, *Denkmäler*; Tarby, 41-42
7 Euringer; Tarby, 42-44
8 The Slavonic version : P Syrku, *De historia correctionis librorum in Bulgaria saeculo XIV*, t.I, (S Petersburg, 1890) 179-218.
9 Fenwick, *Basil and James*, 43-46.
10 On the history of the Greek version: Merc, 123-131; Tarby, 25-44; Witvliet, 153-155.
11 Theodore Balsamon was largely responsible for the suppression of St James, cf Khouri-Sarkis, *S Jacques*, 413-15.
12 Cf Anagnostes, 'La liturgie de Saint Jacques à Jérusalem' in *Echos de l'Orient* 4(1900-1901), 247-8; Tarby, p 33,n 31.

The Syriac Version

The Greek text of the anaphora was translated into Syriac probably before the end of the sixth century. Scholars have suggested different 'possible dates' between 400 and 600 AD.[13] On the basis of a comparative study, G.Khouri-Sarkis has demonstrated that the Syriac version retains several examples of literal rendering into Syriac of Greek words and phrases.[14] A revision of the Syriac translation has been attributed to Jacob of Edessa (died 607). As we will see, it is doubtful whether he had played any significant role in the preparation of the 'New and correct recension' known under his name.

The origin and diffusion of the Syriac text prior to the time of Jacob of Edessa is still obscure. The first version was most probably made by the non-Chalcedonians who were expelled from Antioch by the Emperors Justin I (518-527) and Justinian (527-565). Those who took refuge in the Syriac-speaking regions of Mesopotamia on the Persian-Roman border, soon or later translated the anaphora into Syriac. The following factors might have prompted them to use Syriac as their liturgical language.

(i) A Syriac version was needed as the second generation was more familiar with Syriac than Greek.

(ii) Since the time of Rabbula of Edessa (died 434/435), there was a rather strong anti-Nestorian movement in Edessa, which later merged with the anti-Chalcedonians and adopted the Antiochene liturgical forms in the place of their original Mesopotamian liturgy.[15] The liturgical texts were translated into Syriac, the mother tongue of the new converts.

(iii) The non-Chalcedonians were actively involved in evangelization among the pagans of Mesopotamia and the Arab tribes, most of whom understood Syriac better than Greek. In fact, about 542, Jacob Baradaeus and Theodore of Bostra (in Roman Arabia) were consecrated as missionary bishops. Theodore served the Ghassanid Arabs.[16] John of Ephesus tells the story of Elijah and Theodore, two traders 'who besides worldly trade engaged moreover in divine [trade] also'.[17]

(iv) The incoming of the captives increased the number of non-Chalcedonians in Persia. Following the invasions of the Roman Empire by Chosroes I (531-579) and Chosroes II (589-628), hundreds of thousands of Christian prisoners were brought to Persia. There were priests and some bishops among them. Most of the prisoners were Chalcedonians. Antioch itself was sacked twice, in 540 and again in 611. The Persians built new cities for

13 For a discussion, see Heiming, p 125.

14 Khouri-Sarkis, *S Jacques*, pp 406ff. In fact this had already been noted by Rahmani, *Liturgies*, 118-121. But there are typically Aramaic expressions, which might have been translated and incorporated into the Greek text. Cf Khouri-Sarkis, *op cit*, 406-7.

15 See S H Moffett, *A History of Christianity in Asia, Vol.I: Beginnings to 1500* (2nd ed, Orbis, New York, 1998), 186-197; 243-47. In fact, since the Synod of Mar Issac (410), the Persian Church was rather open to the antiochene liturgical practices. Cf *Ibid.* 151-157

16 *Ibid*, 245.

17 John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, PO.XVIII, 576-585; esp 577 (= Life of James).

the large number of prisoners. The best known among the new cities was a second Gundeshapur near Seleucia-Ctesiphon, the 'better Antioch of Chosroes'. It was indeed dangerous for the Chalcedonian prisoners to practise the religion of the 'Romans', the bitter enemies of the Zoroastrian Persians. As Moffett says, 'it was only natural that among the unhappy ranks of these thousands of captured and displaced Christians in a pagan land the mission-minded Syrian Orthodox Clergy should find some of their most receptive hearers'.[18] We do not know whether the widespread use of St James and the Antiochene rite in Syriac-speaking Mesopotamia has anything to do with this community of captives from Antioch.

We cannot exclude the possibility that the Greek text was rendered into Syriac more than once and at different places to meet the new situation, though no documentary evidence is available to support this hypothesis.

The manuscript tradition of the Syriac version has been carefully studied by A.Rücker and O.Heiming.[19] Rücker had consulted 57 manuscripts of which five are of Maronite origin. They belong to a period extending from the eighth to the nineteenth centuries. The most ancient witness is an eighth century palimpsest fragment (BM.Add.14615) of which the upper writing belongs to tenth/eleventh century.[20] Rücker had classified the manuscripts into three groups:

(i) An ancient textual tradition attested by a few manuscripts, all of which are fragments, belonging to a period before the eleventh century.[21]
(ii) The so-called **NCR.**
(iii) *Textus receptus.*

The title 'the New (and Correct) Recension of Jacob of Edessa' that the second group of manuscripts bears, implies that Jacob had corrected the old Syriac version on the basis of the existing Greek texts. According to Rücker, the most ancient manuscript of this group is BM.286 (add.14493: tenth cent.), which bears the following title: 'Anaphora of Holy Mar Jacob, brother of Our Lord: New recension of Jacob of Edessa'. This manuscript served as the basis for Rücker's edition.

O.Heiming had done a thorough study of the sources used by Rücker, examining about 75 witnesses. According to him, the most ancient manuscript of the second group is not BM.add.14493 (used by Rücker), but BM.193 (add.14499: dated tenth/eleventh century by W.Wright). Rücker had dated it as eleventh century. But Heiming argued that it belongs to the tenth, and that the sections including the anaphora are certainly older than those of add. 14493. Thus he chose add.14499 as the basis of his edition, which, based on 30 manuscripts, including add.14615 (the most ancient known fragment of the Syriac version), is the most reliable version we have.

18 *Ibid*, 247.
19 Rücker, xvi-xviii; xxv-xxix; Heiming, 111-119; 125-134.
20 Published by: O Heiming, 'Palimpsestbruchstucke der syrischen Version der Jakobusanaphora aus dem 8.Jahrhundert in der Handschrift add.14615 des British Museum' (OCP 16, 1950), 190-200.
21 Rücker points out five mss: BM.824 (add.14615); BM 256 (add.14523); BM.268 (add.14523); BM.add.14494; BM.285 (add.14518). In the edition of the Syriac S James by Connolly, 14523 (=A+A2), 14518 (=B), and 14494 (=C) have been used. Cf Connolly, *S James* 90-111 (Eng).

Jacob of Edessa and NCR

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, liturgists rarely doubted the authenticity of the tradition that Jacob of Edessa had corrected the **OSV**.[22] But Rücker and Heiming both brought valid arguments against this attribution. There are considerable number of differences between the Greek and the Syriac Versions, as well as between **NCR** and the commentaries that bear Jacob's name.

1. **JETh**: This work is quoted by Dionysius Bar Salibi (died 1171) in his *Commentary on the Eucharist*.[23] Two other recensions are also known - one in the *West Syrian Synodicon* and the other in the *Nomocanon* of Bar Hebraeus.[24] **JETh** as quoted by Bar Salibi may not be the original. It might be a version later revised in the light of the evolution of **SyJ**.[25]

2. **JEGS**: This consists of three parts, an arrangement probably made later:

(i) An explication of the symbolism of various liturgical objects (probably a later addition).

(ii) Rubrics on the signing of the cross (parallel to the second part of **JETh**).

(iii) An outline of the anaphora (much older than **JETh**). Rahmani had published an abridged version (having few variants) of this outline.[26]

JEGS was also known to Bar Salibi who quotes from it. It might be a summary of a larger commentary by Jacob. In the structure of the anaphora, there are striking differences between **JETh** and **JEGS**. The latter has preserved an ancient structure that agrees in some respects with the **OSV**. Both **JETh** and **JEGS** disagree with **NCR** in the case of the introductory part of the anaphora. A comparative study leads to the following conclusions.[27]

(i) If the attribution of **JEGS** is correct, Jacob of Edessa had probably played very little role in producing **NCR**. In **JEGS**, the fraction is a utilitarian action that precedes communion (as in **GrJ**); but in **NCR** it comes between the intercessions and the Lord's Prayer.

(ii) Most probably the anaphora known to **JEGS** had no Lord's Prayer. Thus the comments on the Lord's Prayer have been placed after *Sancta Sanctis*. In the earliest antiochene anaphoras (**AC** and **TD**), the Lord's Prayer was absent. Thus in the Syrian Orthodox baptismal liturgy, modelled on the anaphora, the Lord's Prayer is omitted.

(iii) In **NCR** the intercessions have been divided into six canons. The commentaries of Jacob are silent on this division.

(iv) The institution narrative given in **JEGS** is different from that of **NCR**.

(v) **JETh**, even if its original redaction could go back to Jacob, was obviously revised later.

22 Rahmani never doubted it. Cf *Liturgies*, 118.

23 **DbS**

24 *Synodicon* Vol. I, CSCO.368, 206-210; Bar Hebraeus, *Nomocanon*, 4:7 (pp 47-50).

25 See my forthcoming study, 'Anaphora of Saint James and Jacob of Edessa', to be published in K D Jenner, *Jacob of Edessa and the Syriac Culture of His day* (Leiden, 2001(?)).

26 Rahmani, *I fasti*, xix-xx.

27 Cf my study quoted in note 25 above

(vi) The attribution of **NCR** to Jacob of Edessa was obviously not known to Moses bar Kepha (died 903) and Dionysius Bar Salibi (died 1171).

(vii) It was a general custom of the West Syrians to attribute the anaphoras to the apostles, apostolic fathers, Greek fathers of the third and fourth centuries and the major figures of the Syrian Orthodox Church. This might have happened in the case of **NCR**.

Some of these points will be briefly discussed in the course of this Study.

Related Versions

In the thirteenth century, Gregory Bar Hebraeus (died 1286) had abridged **SyJ**. This shorter version is used in the Malankara Orthodox Church (India).[28]

The Armenian version was probably made from **OSV**. A.Baumstark and A.Rücker, had compared the Armenian with the Greek and Syriac texts and had concluded that at some points it follows the Greek and at others the Syriac text.[29] However, Rücker is of opinion that the Armenian is closer to the Syriac. Baumstark had suggested that a rather different sixth century translation was known to Julianists[30], and that the Armenian St James could be derived from it.[31]

The Ethiopian text of St James is a direct translation of **OSV**.[32] O.Heiming has identified a number of literal translations from the Syriac. The long anamnesis, a main characteristics of **OSV**, has been retained in the Ethiopian text, which seems to have been translated in the sixth or seventh century, during the Syrian mission to Ethiopia.[33]

It has been generally assumed that the Georgian version was made from a Greek text older than the *textus receptus*.[34] But G.Peradze has suggested that the Georgian text was translated from Syriac and not from Greek as we generally suppose.[35] There are striking resemblances between the Georgian and Syriac versions in the arrangement and the contents of the 'three prayers', and their Georgian version may well derive both order and themes from the Syriac.[36]

28 Critical edition: A Raes, **AS.II-ii** (1953), 181-209. The text has been printed several times since 1900 at Pampakuda, Kerala (India). Cf S Brock, 'Two Recent Editions of Syrian Orthodox anaphoras' in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 102 (1988), 436-445.

29 Baumstark, *Denkmäler*, 6; Rücker, p xx.

30 The followers of Julian of Halicarnassus who was opposed to Severus of Antioch.

31 *Op cit*, 5-8. According to F E Brightman, the Armenian had been abridged from the Syriac, p xcviii.

32 Rücker, xxi; Tarby, 43.

33 Mercier, PO.XXVI, 128.

34 Conybeare-Wadrop; P M Tarchnisvili, 'Eine neue georgische Jakobusliturgie' in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 62 (1948), 49-82.

35 G Peradze, 'Les monuments liturgiques prebyzantines en langue georgienne' in *Le Muséon* 45 (1932), 255- 272, p 269-272.

36 See my study quoted in note 25 above.

Preparation rites and the Pre-anaphora

The present structure of **SyJ** seems to have been fixed as early as the eighth century. However the preparation rites, the pre-anaphora, *Ordo Communis* and *Ordo Diaconalis* have a different history and only slowly attained the present form. Their structure and contents were not fixed until the fifteenth century. Several elements were added to them even in the nineteenth. Space limits prevent us making a detailed study of them.[37]

Structure of the Anaphora

For those who are not familiar with **SyJ** the following outline clarifies its structure and introduces the order of the main chapters of this Study.

I. Introductory prayers: 'The three prayers':
   A. Prayer of peace.
   B. Prayer of the imposition of hands.
   C. Prayer over the veil.

2. The Anaphora
   D. Trinitarian blessing.
   E. Introductory Dialogue.
   F. Prayer of the Offering.
   G. Sanctus.
   H. Post-Sanctus.
   J. Institution Narrative.
   K. Anamnesis.
   L. Epiclesis.

3. Intercessions
   M. Six-fold Canons.

4. Preparation for the Communion.
   N. Rites before the Fraction.
   P. Fraction
   Q. Lord's Prayer.
   R. Rites before *Sancta Sanctis*.
   S. Holy Things to the Holy

5. Communion and Post-communion
   T. Communion
   V. The Thanksgiving Prayer.
   W. Dismissal
   X. Post-communion.

37 cf B Varghese, 'Early History of the Preparation rites in the Syrian Orthodox Anaphora' in *Symposium Syriacum* VII, (OCA 256, 1998), 127-138.

I.
Introductory Prayers: 'The Three Prayers'

SyJ in its present form begins with the prayer before the peace, followed by the prayer of the imposition of hands and the prayer over the veil. For the sake of convenience, we shall refer to them as the 'Three Prayers' and label them 'A', 'B, and 'C'. A schematic outline of the introductory part as attested by **JEGS**, **JETh**, **MbK** and **NCR** will be helpful to understand its evolution.

JEGS	**JETh**	**NCR**	**Mbk**
	Three Prayers *('formerly one sign of the cross during the peace').*	Three Prayers	Three Prayers
1. 'Glory to the Father'	1. Deacon: 'Stand well.'	1. (A) Prayer before the peace	1. (A) Prayer before the Peace
2. Kiss of Peace (probably without any formula).	2. Kiss of Peace 'Peace be to you.' 'With your spirit.'	2. Kiss of Peace Deacon: 'Peace be to you all' People: 'With your spirit.'	2. Kiss of Peace
3. 'Love of God the Father'	3. 'Love of God the Father' (three crosses).	3. Deacon: 'Bow down the heads.'	3. Reading of the Book of Life
4. Dialogue.	4. Dialogue.	4. (B) Prayer of the imposition of the hands.	4. Washing of the hands
		5. (C) Prayer over the veil;	5. Deacon: 'Bow down the heads.'
		6. Lifting up of the veil; People's response.	6. (B) The Prayer of the imposition of hands
		7. Deacon: 'Stand well.'	7. Deacon: 'Let us stand well.'
		8. 'Love of God the Father' (three crosses)	8. (C) Prayer over the veil
		9. Dialogue.	9. Lifting up of the veil; People's response.
			10. 'Love of God the Father'
			11. People: 'Amen' *(thrice)*
			12. Dialogue.

According to **JEGS**, the anaphora begins with 'Glory to the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit'.[38] It is followed by the kiss of peace, the Trinitarian blessing ('Love of God . . .') and the dialogue. **JEGS** does not mention the 'Three Prayers' with which **NCR** begins.

38 'Then in the beginning the priest begins (saying): "Glory to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit", symbolizing the unity of the One nature and essence of the Trinity, showing that it is indivisibly separated and unconfusedly united.' (Berlin Sachau 218, fol.181r).

JETh on the other hand gives a rather developed outline of the celebration, beginning with the pre-anaphora, which includes the reading of the scriptures, dismissal of the hearers, energumens and penitents.[39] Then the doors are closed and the Creed is recited. On the beginning of the anaphora **JETh** says:

> 'So when the faith of the fathers was written, it seemed right that it should be added in the order of the *qûrôbô* (. . .). And after this that there should be prayers of the faithful, three in number, with closed doors: soon after when diverse rites and feasts were arranged in the church they made[40] these three prayers of the faithful—one of them for the petition of the mystical peace, the second of the imposition of the hand, and the third that with which they uncover the table and signify thereby that the doors of heaven are opened.'[41]

The 'three prayers' are followed by the deacon's admonition to 'Stand well' and the kiss of peace. **JEGS** makes no reference to the 'three prayers', whereas **JETh** seems to claim that they had been introduced by the fathers of Nicea.

The outline of the anaphora given in **JEGS** was known to Bar Salibi, probably in its present form. Thus he quotes from it:

'Again we say that the *qurobo* is divided into five parts. The beginning of the first part is "Glory to the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit." Jacob of Edessa says that the priest begins with these words to teach the unity of the nature and the essence of the three hypostases...'[42]

Bar Salibi seems to have ignored the difference between **JEGS** and **JETh**. His comments give the impression that, in the twelfth century, the prayer before peace was preceded by 'Glory to the Father'. He quotes Bar Kepha who censured this doxology. Apparently, Bar Salibi does not disapprove it:

'Bishop Moses, who is called Bar Kepha, says: It is not meet to say "Glory to the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit" before the prayer of peace. Not because it is not meet to glorify the Son and the Holy Spirit with the Father from whom they have glory and essence, but so that nobody should think that the priest offers *qurobo* in the name of the three persons.'[43]

However, none of the manuscripts of St James mentions the doxology. The reason might be that it was an invariable part of the *Ordo Communis* and was a normal doxology that does not need to be mentioned in the text.[44]

According to Bar Kepha, in some places, the prayer before peace was preceded by one or two prayers of absolution. He censures them as well.[45]

39 **JETh** comments on the dismissal: 'But all these things are disappearing from the Church, even though the deacon evokes its memory at various points, proclaiming (the words) after the ancient custom.' (**DbS**. 3:1, p 7.)

40 We have underlined the text. When we read the text in continuity with the reference to the Nicene Creed, we will get the impression that the word 'they' refers to the fathers of Nicea.

41 Brightman, 491

42 **DbS** 8:5, p 48. Another quotation in 10:4, p 58.

43 **DbS** 8:6, p 48-49; cf **MbK**, p 39-40.

44 Maronites have retained this doxology, which has completely disappeared in the Syrian Orthodox Church. Cf M Hayek, *Liturgie Maronite. Histoire et textes eucharistiques* (Paris, 1964), 254.

45 **MbK**, 38-39; cf **DbS** 8:4, p 48.

Origin of the 'Three Prayers'

The first known document that mentions the presence of the 'three prayers' before the kiss of peace is the 19th canon of Laodicea (343-381).[46] We do not know whether the themes of the prayers of which canon 19 speaks correspond to those which were added to James.

In the early sixth century, Severus of Antioch says that in Palestine and in Jerusalem, the lifting up of the veil was accompanied by a prayer:

> '[In] Palestine and in Jerusalem, while the priest makes the said prayer, the deacons frequently and ceaselessly lift (the cover) up and let it down again, until the end of the prayer, and so after that the priest begins the petition over the offering of the sacrifice.'[47]

Severus speaks of the prayer over the veil only, and is silent on the prayer before peace and the prayer of the imposition of the hand. Even though the canon 19 of Laodicea refers to the 'Three Prayers', there is no evidence that they were already in the anaphora of St James by the time of Severus, as G.Khouri-Sarkis believes.[48] **JEGS** suggests that they were not yet part of the **OSV**. How did they find place in **SyJ**?

Bar Kepha is the first authentic witness to there being the 'three prayers' in the anaphora. From the summary of them that he quotes, we can assume that their contents (= as given in **NCR**) were already fixed in the ninth century.[49]

The three prayers of **NCR** (labelled here as A,B and C) differ considerably from the corresponding prayers in **GrJ**, which has four: (I) Prayer by the priest for himself; (II) Prayer for the people; (III) Prayer for the offering (by St Basil); (IV) Prayer of the veil.[50] I, III and IV have not much in common with the Syriac text. The prayer for the people (II) has been given in Syriac as the prayer of the veil. Surprisingly, the Georgian version agrees with the Syriac.[51] Thus the Georgian version gives all the three prayers of **NCR**. But 'the prayer by the

46 Canon 19: 'After the sermons of the Bishops, the prayer for the catechumens is made first by itself; and after the catechumens have gone out, the prayer for those who are under penance; and after these have passed under the hand [of the Bishop] and departed, then should be offered the three prayers of the faithful, the first to be said entirely in silence, the second and third aloud, and then the [kiss of] peace is to be given. And after the presbyters have given the [kiss of] peace to the Bishop, then the laity are to give it [to one another], and so the Holy Oblation is to be completed.' (*A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church: Second Series* (NPNF) XIV, 136).

47 Severus, *Letters:* Letter No.105: To Caesarea the Hypattisa, PO XIV, 257

48 Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, OS.V-1 (1960),10 (=note 3); V-2 (1960), 149-50 (= note 12).

49 **MbK**, 40-41. John of Dara (ninth century) also refers to the three prayers. We do not know whether they agree with the present form of the prayers, both in their themes and in the arrangement. Cf John of Dara, 4:2-3, p 75-76.

50 Mercier, 190-96; cfr. Eng.tr. J.M.Neale, *The Liturgies of S Mark, S James, S Clement, S Chrysostom . . .* (London, 1859), 45-48.

51 Conybeare-Wadrop, 402-4; In the Georgian version translated by M Tarchnisvili, the prayers are different: I. Prayer by the priest for himself; II. Prayer of Saint Basil; III. Prayer of the veil (with the title: third prayer of the Apostle Jacob, brother of Our Lord) (= same as the prayer of the veil in Syriac). Cf *Ephemerides Liturgicae*. 62(1948), 62-64 (= # 14,15,16).

priest for himself' (= Greek-I) has been inserted between B and C, which was preceded by an ektenia by the deacon. Both in Syriac and Georgian, the kiss of peace comes between A and B; so does this mean that both are based on a Greek textual tradition different from the *textus receptus*? It is not improbable. But we cannot completely ignore the possibility that the Georgian text derives its order and content from Syriac. The question needs to be studied in detail. In fact, G.Peradze has already suggested that the Georgian text was translated from Syriac and not from Greek as generally supposed.[52] If the Georgian version of the three prayers is based on a Syriac text, we can infer an earlier date for their introduction (that is, the end of the seventh century or the beginning of the eighth, the probable date for the Georgian translation).[53]

Most probably, the three prayers were not part of **OSV**. Armenian St James, which is based on an earlier version, does not contain them.[54] The redactors of **NCR** might have translated them from Greek. **JEGS** suggests that Jacob of Edessa would not have played any role in it. But their presence in **JETh** does not necessarily provide any proof for Jacob's role. In fact A.Vööbus and G.Khouri-Sarkis have suggested that the corpus of documents attributed to Jacob does not necessarily represent the liturgical tradition that could go back to his time.[55]

Moses bar Kepha comments on the three prayers as if they had long been part of the anaphora. In the twelfth century, Bar Salibi refers to the prayer before peace as the *incipit* of the **SyJ**.[56]

Bar Kepha gives an arrangement of the introductory prayers different from that of **NCR**. Thus the reading of the Book of Life and the washing of the hands followed the kiss of peace. The former has disappeared in **NCR**, whereas the washing takes place before the prayer of peace. The difference could be as follows: Bar Kepha comments on the liturgical customs of Mosul (the seat of the Maphrian), whereas **NCR** follows the tradition of the dioceses of the Syrian Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. In fact in the Syrian Orthodox Church, there existed two liturgical traditions known as 'Western' and 'Eastern', those of the Patriarchate of Antioch and of the Maphrianate (or Catholicate) of Tagrit (later transferred to Mosul) respectively. In the course of time, the 'Western tradition' prevailed over the 'Eastern'. The easterners still preserve a few customs, different from their western brothers.[57]

52 G Peradze, *op.cit*, 269-272.

53 Cf S Verhelst, 'L'histoire de la liturgie Melkite de Saint Jacques. Interprétations anciennes et nouvelles' in *Proche Orient-Chretien* 43 (1993), 229-272, 264, n 88.

54 The Ethiopian text published by Euringer begins with the Trinitarian blessing.

55 A.Vööbus, Introduction to *Synodicon*, CSCO.368, p 16-18; Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.V-1 (1960), 9. Khouri-Sarkis rightly points out that JETh has been amplified.

56 **DbS** 2:7, p 6-7.

57 Cf B Varghese, 'Some Common elements in the East and West Syrian liturgies' in *The Harp* XI-XII (Kottayam, 1998-99).

A. PRAYER BEFORE PEACE (AND THE KISS OF PEACE)

The kiss of peace in **NCR** has the following elements:

(a) The prayer before peace;
(b) *Priest*: 'Peace be to you all'; *People*: 'And with your spirit';
(c) Deacon's exhortation to give peace and the people's response.
(d) Kiss of peace.

(a) The Prayer before Peace

Quoting from St James, Moses Bar Kepha explains the meaning of the prayer before peace, the first among the three prayers:

> 'This prayer is a supplication to God the Father that he would grant us that with cleanliness of heart and with divine love we may give peace one to another.'[58]

The prayer before peace, as well as all the prayers of the anaphora (except the anamnesis and the final thanksgiving prayer) are addressed to the Father. On Maundy Thursday and the Saturday of Holy Week, there is no greeting of peace and special prayers are said in its place. Surprisingly, these are addressed to the Son. Before the time of Bar Kepha, at least some of the prayers of the anaphora were addressed to the Son, for he instructs his clergy to correct prayers not addressed to the Father.[59] Thus most probably the prayers here in Passiontide follow an older tradition.[60]

(b) 'Peace be to you all'

Bar Salibi says that the priest greets peace, following 'the example of the peace that our Lord gave to his disciples'. [61] The custom of 'giving' peace several times in the anaphora became part of the antiochene liturgy as early as the time of St John Chrysostom.[62] St James liturgy prescribes to give peace on the following occasions:

(i) After the prayer of peace (before the imposition of hands).
(ii) After the Diptychs and before the second benediction.
(iii) After the Lord's Prayer and before the second prayer of the imposition of hands.
(iv) Before the third benediction that precedes the *Sancta Sanctis*.
(v) Before the third prayer of the imposition of hands that follows communion.

Thus normally the peace is given before the three benedictions[63], and before the prayers of the imposition of hands - indeed each time the priest turns towards the people, except at the first (Trinitarian) blessing (= *hubo*), where it may be that the introduction of the three prayers has rearranged the beginning part of the anaphora.

58 **MbK**, 40. Bar Salibi repeats this and adds his modest comments. cf **DbS** 8:7, p 49.
59 **MbK**, 90.
60 See the comments on anamnesis.
61 **DbS**, 8:8, p 49-50. cf Jn 20:19;26.
62 Cf Chrysostom, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Colossians*, Hom.III, PG.62, 322-23.
63 The three benedictions are referred to as *hûbô*, *nêhwûn* and *têhwê* following the *incipit* in Syriac.

When the paten and chalice are brought to the people for giving communion, the priest says four prayers, which are also not preceded by pax. As Khouri-Sarkis observes, these prayers are not part of the anaphora, but of the *Ordo Communis*, and were added between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries.[64] (cf.*infra*)

The people's response *wâl rûhô dilôk* (= 'And with your spirit') is a literal rendering of the Greek *kai meta tou pneumatos sou*. It is an Aramaic expression meaning 'And with you' or 'Same to you'.[65] However, the church fathers have given interesting interpretations. According to Theodore of Mopsuestia (+428), 'And with your spirit' refers to the Holy Spirit that the priest has received in his ordination.[66] **MbK** gives a moderate explanation:

> 'They make answer to the priest as it were to Christ, and say: "And with your Spirit, even that which you did bestow upon us in baptism; may we have that peace and your concord which you gave us when you said: 'My peace I give you, my peace I leave you' (Jn.14.27)".'[67]

(c) Deacon's exhortation and the people's response

The deacon's exhortation consists of two parts: the first part before the peace and the second after:

Deacon: Let us give peace to one another . . . with a holy and divine kiss, in the love of our Lord and God.

People: **Make us worthy, O Lord and God, of this peace all the days of our lives.**

Deacon: After this holy and divine peace . . . let us bow down our heads before the merciful Lord.

People: **Before you, our Lord and our God.**

The deacon's instruction to give peace is attested in **MC** and **AC**.[68] ('Greet one another with a holy kiss': **AC**). Before the tenth century, the Syrian Orthodox anaphoras contained a simple formula like the one found in **AC**[69]; but from then on the tendency is to expand the original formula. Thus the Anaphora of John of Bosra has: 'Let us give each other the holy kiss in the love of the Lord'.[70]

Bar Kepha does not quote the deacon's words. But Bar Salibi gives a simple formula: 'Give peace to each other with a kiss'. Apparently the people's response was still absent in his days.

The deacon's exhortation ('After this holy and divine peace . . .') to bow down the heads is absent in **MC** and **MbK**. But Bar Salibi gives a simple formula.[71] **GrJ**

64 Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.V-1(1960),16-17.
65 *Ibid*.22-23
66 Theodore, *Eucharist*, 91-92.
67 **MbK**, 40; cf **DbS** 8:11, p 51.
68 **MC** V,3; **AC** VIII, 11.17-12.3. No formula is given in **TD**.
69 Eg Anaphora of Timothy of Alexandria: **BM**.add.14520 (eighth/ninth cent): 'Give peace each other' Also in **BM**.add17128 (tenth/eleventh cent.): Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles.
70 **BM**.add.14525.
71 **DbS**, 8:13-14, p 51-52: 'After the peace let us bow down the heads before the Lord'.

and the oldest manuscripts of **SyJ** also contain similar formulae ('Let us bow down our heads before the Lord').[72]

The deacon's litany of **AC** directs the people to 'bend the knee'.[73] So this must have been part of the deacon's litany for the faithful, and perhaps the source of the exhortation in St James. After the sixteenth century, the deacon's exhortation was expanded by further phrases [e.g. '(peace) has been given; merciful (God)']. The people's response is also not very old. Bar Salibi is silent on it.

(d) Kiss of peace

In the East, the kiss of peace usually followed the washing of the hands. In **MC** and **AC**, it is followed by the placing of the bread and wine on the altar.[74] But in the liturgy known to St John Chrysostom, the people exchanged the peace during the offertory procession.[75] There existed two traditions in the Syrian Orthodox Church. The present order, creed-lavabo-pax, originated in the Patriarchate of Antioch, and **NCR** and **DbS** follow it. But, as we have noted, Bar Kepha follows the Mosul tradition with creed-litany (*koruzuto*)-pax-Book of Life-lavabo. So in Mosul lavabo followed pax; but the Mosul 'Easterners' gradually abandoned their order in favour of that of the 'Westerners', possibly some time before the tenth century.

B. PRAYER OF THE IMPOSITION OF HANDS:

There are three 'prayers of the imposition of hands' or 'the prayer over the people' in the anaphora[76]: (a) after the peace, (b) after the Lord's Prayer (c) after the communion and the thanksgiving prayer.[77] Each time the prayer of the imposition of hands is preceded by the greeting of peace and the deacon's exhortation to bow down the heads.

In **AC** (II) there is an indirect allusion to a prayer of the imposition of hands. After the peace and the deacon's litany, the following direction is given:

> 'Then let the bishop, praying for peace upon the people, bless them in these words, as Moses commanded the priests to bless the people: [Num.6.24-26].'[78]

The words 'imposition of hands' are not used, but G.Khouri-Sarkis believes that the blessing included the stretching of hands, as the normal way of blessing in the fourth century.[79] However, the 'Clementine liturgy' of **AC** (VIII) and **TD** do not mention it.

It is difficult to explain why this prayer was introduced. G.Khouri-Sarkis suggests it was to maintain symmetry in the anaphora; that, as the celebration concluded with a prayer of the imposition of hands, the Syrians perhaps

72 **BM**.add.14520, 14525, 17128.
73 **AC** VIII,10.1. cf 10.22.
74 **MC**. V,2-3; **AC**.II,57.15-17; VIII, 12.3.
75 Chrysostom, *De Compunctione* I.3.
76 **MbK** uses these two titles: p 43.
77 On their themes: Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.V-2 (1960), 151 (Note.12).
78 **AC**.II, 57.19.
79 See. A Cody, 'L'eucharistie et les heures canonicals chez les Syriens jacobites' in **OS**.XII-2 (1967), 151-186, p 155. n 5 by Khouri-Sarkis.

introduced a similar prayer at the beginning also. He also suggests that it originates in the dismissal of catechumens and others with an imposition of hands.[80] This seems to me quite possible, as in **AC** the catechumens, energumens, illuminands and the penitents received the bishop's blessing before they left.[81] The prayer seems to have been introduced as the dismissal of the different groups was becoming obsolete (in the ninth century Bar Kepha refers to it as a rite of the past). The prayer's origin in this dismissal can be further supported as Bar Kepha records some people knelt down during the prayer, which censures and directs instead to 'bow down the heads', not to 'bend the knee'.[82]

On the other hand, the prayer of the imposition of hands of **SyJ** corresponds to the bishop's prayer that precedes the anaphora of **AC**.[83]

Currently, the priest does not turn towards the people nor stretch his hands during the prayer of the 'imposition of hands'. The West Syrian documents do not say that the celebrant turned towards the people, stretching his hands, nor that he blessed them with a sign of the cross during the prayers 'over the people'.

C. PRAYER OVER THE VEIL:

The last of the 'three prayers' is called 'prayer over the veil' by Bar Kepha, Bar Salibi and the ancient manuscripts. In the modern printed texts this title has disappeared. In fact, the prayer has lost significance, both by its theme and its place. The prayer is now recited before the lifting up of the veil and it makes no allusion to the veil or its symbolism. Originally the veil might have been raised during the prayer. As we have already noted, Severus of Antioch says that in Palestine and in Jerusalem the veil was raised with a prayer.

How did the custom of covering the bread and wine arise? It may have begun for practical reasons to protect them from dust and dirt.[84] The symbolism that the Syrians attached to the altar and the offerings may also have played a decisive role in its introduction. Syrian fathers saw the altar as the symbol of Christ's tomb. An anonymous fifth/sixth century commentary on the eucharist says: 'The altar is the place of Christ's sepulchre . . . The veil above the cup and the paten (is) a sign of the stone which was placed above the sepulchre of our Saviour'.[85] Jacob of Edessa has taken over this interpretation.[86] Theodore of Mopsuestia interprets the veil similarly, seeing the deposition of the bread and wine on the altar by the deacons as the symbol of the burial of Christ's body:

> 'When they (= the deacons) bring out (the eucharistic bread) they place it on the holy altar, for the complete representation of the passion, so that we may think of him on the altar, as if he were placed in the sepulchre, after having received his passion. This is the reason why those deacons who spread linens on the altar represent the figure of the linen clothes of

80 Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.V-2 (1960), 151-153.
81 **AC**. VIII, 6.10; 7.4; 8.4; 9.6.
82 **MbK**, 43.
83 **AC**.VIII,11.1-6.
84 Cf Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.VIII-1 (1963), 18-19 (= note.15).
85 Brock, *Commentaries*, R.23; 25. Cf D.43; 45.
86 Berlin Sachau 218, fol.178r.

> the burial (of our Lord). Sometime after these have been spread, they stand upon both sides, and agitate all the air above the holy body with fans, thus keeping it from any defiling object. They make manifest by this ritual the greatness of the body which is lying there, as it is the habit, when dead body of the high personages of this world is carried on a bier, that some men should fan the air above it.'[87]

The imagery of a dead body covered with linen clothes might have influenced the origin of the veiling of the elements. The early commentaries on the eucharist point to this possibility. The formula that the priest says silently during the lifting up of the veil (attested after the twelfth century) also contains this idea:

> 'You are the rock of flint which sent forth twelve streams of water for the twelve tribes of Israel. You are the hard rock which was set against the tomb of our Redeemer.'

Severus of Antioch gives an allegorical interpretation of the veil:

> 'The veil which before the priest offers, hides which is set forth and is removed after his entry manifestly cries by the mouth of the facts themselves that the mystery, which was previously concealed by means of the sacrifices of the law and the shadowy service, and was obscurely made known as it were by an indication only, by means of this spiritual and rational priestly ministration reveals Christ who is God to those who have believed on him . . . (In) Palestine and in Jerusalem, while the priest makes the said prayer, the deacons frequently and ceaselessly lift (the veil) up and let it down again, until the end of the prayer, and so after that the priest begins the petition over the offering of the sacrifice. Further what is done in this fashion reminds us of that veil or linen sheet which came down from heaven upon Peter, which contained all the quadrupeds and reptiles, and birds cleans and unclean, and signified to him that the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out not only on the people of Israel which was clean, because it received God's law, but upon all the nations which were without law and unclean.'[88]

Most West Syrian commentators repeat these ideas without much modification. For example, Bar Kepha writes:

> 'And we say that the anaphora is spread over the mysteries for these reasons. First: because it signifies the secretness and invisibleness of the Godhead which is hidden in the mysteries. Secondly: it is the symbol of the stone which was placed over the tomb of our Redeemer. Thirdly: it makes known that Emmanuel himself was covered over and hidden in the sacrifices of the Law and in that figurative service.'[89]

Then he says that the lifting up and lowering of the veil symbolizes the vision of Peter (Acts 10.1-16) and continues:

> 'And God signified to him by this, that it was not only to the people of the Jews, whom the law used to cleanse, that this grace of holy baptism was

87 Theodore, *Eucharist*, 86.
88 Severus, *Letter* 105 (To Caesarea the Hypatissa), PO.XIV, 256-58.
89 **MbK**, 44-45.

> given, but to the peoples also, who aforetime were defiled. Wherefore the anaphora also they lift up and let down, that they may signify that this grace of the holy mysteries has been given for pardon to all those who have believed in Christ, whether they be of the people or of the peoples [Gentiles].'[90]

According to Severus, it was the deacons who lifted up the anaphora. Since he points it out as a practice in 'Palestine and Jerusalem', we can assume that in his days, in Antioch, it was the priests who did it. Bar Kepha does not say clearly whether it was the deacons or the priest who lifted up the anaphora.

According to John of Dara (ninth century), three priests (the celebrant and two assistants on either side) lifted up the veil. He gives the rubrics:

> 'Then it is raised from the west, and from the south and from the north. It is raised from the west, because God came towards the west, that is towards all who are in the darkness: again from the west to show that the darkness has been "raised" from the Romans. Then from the south: similarly the veil was raised from the sons of Ham, who are the Egyptians and the Indians . . . Then from the north: the veil was raised from the magi, who are from the north (that is) Persia . . . That the anaphora should not be raised from the east: that is, the eastern side is the type of the holy angels, who do not have the veil of ignorance.'[91]

This is the beginning of a system of complicated rubrics, originating from allegorical interpretation of the rites, such as became increasingly fashionable in the Syrian Orthodox Church after the twelfth century.

As we have already noted, the veil is no more lifted up during the 'prayer over the veil', but after it. This custom goes back to Bar Kepha, and the veil was lifted up without any formula until the twelfth century, when a brief ('You are the rock of flint . . .') was introduced.

Liturgical texts give the following direction: 'The priest lifts up the veil and waves it three times over the Mysteries, saying in a low voice: "You are the rock . . ."' Modern texts are more detailed: 'The priest folds the veil and encircle it around the Mysteries, twice in the clockwise and once in the anticlockwise direction. Then he kisses it and puts it on the altar to his left hand side.'[92]

Though we can say that the threefold movements symbolize the Holy Trinity, I have found no satisfactory explanation for the movements in 'two clockwise and one anti-clockwise directions'.

During the lifting up of the veil, the deacon makes an exhortation ('Let us stand well, let us stand with fear . . .'), followed by the people's response ('Mercy, peace, sacrifice and thanksgiving'). These are attested in the Greek text as well, but are absent in **MC** and **AC**. The exhortation corresponds to the one found in **TD**.[93] Ancient manuscripts usually give only the *incipit*. The people's response is a later addition.

90 *Ibid.* 45.

91 John of Dara, 2:15, 41-43.

92 Cf Metropolitan Mar Athanasius Yeshu Samuel, *Anaphora. The Divine Liturgy of Saint James the First Bishop of Jerusalem, according to the Rite of the Syrian Orthodox Church of Antioch* (1967) p 37,n 2. (= Yeshu Athanasius). This translation has been reproduced in P Tovey (ed), *The Liturgy of St James as presently used* (Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Study 40, 1998).

93 **TD**. I, 23. Fenwick, *op cit*, p 14.

2.
The Anaphora

D. TRINITARIAN BLESSING

The anaphora proper begins with the Trinitarian blessing adapted from the Pauline formula (2 Cor.13.13): 'The love of God the Father, the grace of the only-begotten Son and the communion and indwelling of the Holy Spirit be with you all, my brethren, for ever and ever.' As the priest recites it, he turns to the people and makes three signs of cross over them. The Pauline order of Son-Father-Holy Spirit has been modified, probably in the light of the fourth century theological developments.[94] **AC** is the earliest witness to the liturgical use of the modified formula: 'The grace of God Almighty, and the love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.'[95] The Trinitarian blessing is not attested by **MC** and **TD**.

The blessing was introduced into St James probably at Antioch.[96] **JEGS** comments on its meaning:

> 'And the "love of God the Father" shows the love in which God gave his Son for us, as said Paul[97]; "grace of the only begotten Son" shows that, because of the grace towards each man, he tasted death. "And the communion of the Holy Spirit" (shows that) the sacrifice is accomplished by the communion of the Holy Spirit. The priest says these three "shall be with you all", and they answer "With you also".'[98]

JETh apparently claims that the 'fathers of Nicea' had introduced the Trinitarian blessing. After having mentioned the deacon's admonition to 'Stand well', Jacob continues:

> 'And when they have collected their thoughts, the priest turns and gives them peace saying "Peace be to you all" and makes over them the sign of the cross and they answer him "With your spirit". But the fathers[99] afterwards arranged this place and judged that at the time of the cross they should say "The love of God the Father, the grace of the only begotten Son and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with you all." Instead of one cross, the priest should make three over the people.'[100]

94 For a study on different forms of blessing: H Engberding, 'Der Gruss des Priesters zu Beginn der Eucharistie in den östlichen Liturgien' in *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 9 (1929), 138-143. A Baumstark, *Liturgie comparée*, (Chevtogne, 1953), 92-94. R.Taft, 'Dialogue.I' in OCP 52 (1986), 299-324.

95 **AC**, VIII,12,4. But in the blessing before the reading of the Gospel, the Pauline formula has been used (see VIII,5,11).

96 Khouri-Sarkis, *Notes*, **OS**.V-1 (1960), 22.

97 Rom 5.8; 8.32; Eph 2.4.

98 Berlin Sachau 218, fol.181v. cf **MbK**, 46. Bar Kepha quotes Jacob of Edessa, without acknowledging the source.

99 The reference to 'the fathers' should be read in continuity with the preceding paragraphs of **JETh**.

100 Brightman, 491.

Here Jacob says that originally the greeting of the peace was accompanied by a sign of the cross, which has been transferred to the Trinitarian blessing, which was eventually increased to three. Now the pax in the anaphora is no more accompanied by the sign of the cross. Instead of the sign of the cross, the priest moves his right hand over the mysteries and makes a half turn towards the people and raises his right hand over the people. But the pax before the reading of the Gospel is still accompanied by a sign of the cross, which might be the survival of an earlier tradition.

The Trinitarian blessing contains a theologically rich Syriac word *magnonuto* (root: *agen*), which means 'indwelling', 'descent' or 'effusion'. It refers to the permanent presence of the Spirit. So the greeting means: 'May the communion of the Holy Spirit descend upon you and remain in you for ever.'[101]

As the people's response 'And with your spirit' is also given by **AC**[102], it is evident that it was part of the blessing from the very beginning. It probably derives from 2 Tim 4.22: 'The Lord be with your spirit. Grace be with you'.

E. INTRODUCTORY DIALOGUE:

The dialogue is attested as part of the anaphora since the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus of Rome.[103] It was certainly part of the original redaction of St James. Thus we find it in **MC**:

Priest: Lift up your hearts.
People: **We lift them up unto the Lord**.
Priest : Let us give thanks to the Lord.
People: **It is meet and right**.(**MC**.V,4-5).

AC also gives similar formulae (VIII,2). But instead of 'hearts', **AC** uses 'minds'. St James has combined both as 'hearts and minds', and this has entered almost all the West Syrian anaphoras.[104] **JEGS** gives 'minds' and **JETh** 'hearts'. Bar Kepha attests a further expansion: 'minds, thoughts, and hearts', which became part of *Textus receptus*.

The exhortation 'Lift up the hearts' echoes the Pauline formula: 'Set your minds on things that are above, not on things that are on earth' (Col.3.2).[105]

101 Cf A Cody, '*Éucharistie* . . .' in OS.XII-2 (1967), 157: note (8) by G Khouri-Sarkis.

102 **AC**, VIII,12,4. cf VIII,5,11.

103 Cf E Lanne, 'Liturgie eucharistique en Orient et en Occident (1er-4e siècles)' in *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité* (DS) 9 (1978), 887-89. Whether the anaphora of Hippolytus represents the third century liturgical practices of Rome is open to discussion. Cf P F Bradshaw, *The Search for the origins of Christian Worship* (Oxford, 1992), 89-92.

104 Three tenth century manuscripts of the Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles give: 'Meditations and thoughts' (*hârgê w-rêyônê*). Cf **AS**.I-ii (1940), 214.

105 Cf Ps 25.1; Lamentations 3.41; Jn 11.41. Bar Kepha's comments seems to have been inspired by Col.3.2: '"On high be the minds . ": That is: now the holy mysteries have been revealed, the doors of heaven have been opened, and the holy hosts and the spirits of the righteous have come down for honouring the mysteries, "on high be our minds and thoughts", and not below in earthly things.' **MbK**, 46; cf **DbS**, 10:3, p 58. also. **MC**, V,4.

By the time of Bar Kepha, the original invitation 'Let us give thanks to the Lord' (**MC, AC, TD, JEGS, JETh**) has been amplified as 'In fear let us give thanks to the Lord'. 'In fear' may have been added under the influence of the commentaries which saw the anaphora as an image of the heavenly liturgy and used lofty words and images to evoke awe in the minds of the believers. Thus Bar Kepha is one of the earliest West Syrian writers to comment on the solemnity of the moment:

> 'And why does he command them to confess to the Lord in fear? We say, for three reasons. First: because the mysteries which were hidden have been revealed. Secondly: because the angels have come down and stood around about the mysteries. Thirdly: on account of this great gift which he has given us.'[106]

The words 'Let us give thanks' imply that the whole congregation is involved in the act of offering, which is further emphasized by the people's assent 'It is meet and right', an expression already attested by **MC**. The Syriac expression *shôwé w-zôdêq* ('It is meet and right') became fixed since **TD** and has entered all the West Syrian anaphoras including St James. The response corresponds to the acclamation '*Axios*', that the assembly cries out in the ordination of a bishop.

As the veil is lifted up, the priest raises his hands, symbolizing the lifting up of the hearts. The general rule is that the celebrant should raise his hands when the mysteries are uncovered. Thus the part of the anaphora from the dialogue till the *Sancta Sanctis* is recited with hands lifted up. After the *Sancta Sanctis*, the mysteries are covered and the rest of the prayers are said with hands placed on the breast. The rubrics regarding this posture are found in manuscripts of later origin.

F. PRAYER OF THE OFFERING

Following the dialogue, the central part of the anaphora begins. The central part, consisting of sanctus, post-sanctus, institution narrative, anamnesis and epiclesis, is the oldest stratum of St James and it has resisted most of the revisions of the anaphora. As we will see, the **OSV** betrays tendencies of expansion, probably following the example of the early antiochene anaphoras like **AC**. But **NCR** and the shorter version of St James (made by Bar Hebraeus), as well as the later West Syrian anaphoras which were modelled on them, witness to a desire to abridge.

After the dialogue, the priest waves his hands over the mysteries saying the following *ghôntô*: 'Truly it is meet and right and fitting and due is it that we should glorify you, we should bless you, we should praise you, we should worship you, we should give thanks to you, the maker of all creation visible and invisible.'[107]

As this has been considered as the first prayer of the offering, ancient manuscripts add a note: 'The priest begins to offer bowing'.[108] Bar Kepha's

106 **MbK**, 48.
107 Heiming, 142. The text varies in different manuscripts. *Ghôntô* = a prayer of inclining. Latin: *Oratio secreta*.
108 Connolly, *St James*, 93.

comments underline this tradition:

> '"It is meet and right":- That is, "It is meet and right" that we should confess to him in fear, as you have said. And because the priest sees that he and all the people are become one body, he takes their (expression of) assent and bows down to offer for them this sacrifice; and he confesses to his Lord secretly, saying: "Truly meet and right is it that we should glorify you, we should bless *etc.*" This is the beginning of the offering (*Qûrbânâ*) and from here the priest begins to offer.'[109]

In **GrJ**, the prayer of offering has become the introductory part of the sanctus, and this is true for the Syriac as well. Unlike **GrJ**, in Syriac, the prayer of offering has been prescribed as *ghôntô*, and the sanctus aloud.

It is doubtful whether **MC** had a prayer of the offering in the strict sense. Thus after having mentioned the response 'It is meet and right', Cyril passes over to the first part of the sanctus.[110] The long prayer of offering (or pre-sanctus) was an antiochene feature (eg.,**AC**,**TD**). The prayer of offering is a thanksgiving addressed to God the Father which in **AC** is for the creation of the world, whereas in **TD** it is for the salvation of humanity through the incarnation.

Most probably, the **OSV** contained a rather long prayer of offering similar to **AC** (VIII,12,6-27) and **TD** (I,23). Thus long prayers are found in the anaphoras of **ATim** and John of Bosra, which were modelled on the **OSV**. The redactor of **NCR** might have abridged the long prayer of offering and it was the shorter form that was known to Bar Kepha. Bar Hebraeus further abridged the prayer suppressing the adjectives: 'Truly it is meet and right to confess, to worship and to glorify the maker of the whole creation'.

In the later anaphoras, the prayer of offering has been understood as a glorification of the Holy Trinity. Thus the anaphora of Dionysius Bar Salibi has: 'It is meet and right to glorify and to confess the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit, the one true God'.[111]

G. SANCTUS

Sanctus is in fact the continuation of 'Lift up the hearts'. When the 'hearts and minds' are lifted up, the eyes of the mind are opened to behold the throne of God, surrounded by innumerable angelic choirs that worship God.[112] Thus in St James, the prayer of offering leads to the pre-sanctus:

> 'Whom the heavens of heaven glorify and all the hosts of them, the sun and the moon and all the choir of the stars, the earth and the sea and all that is in them, the heavenly Jerusalem, the church of the first born who are inscribed in heaven, angels, archangels, lordships, authorities, thrones, dominations, the powers which are above the world, the heavenly armies, the cherubim with many eyes, and the seraphim with six wings, who

109 **MbK**, 48.
110 Tarby considers the prayer of the offering as part of the primitive form. Cf p 49-50.
111 Syriac Text and Malayalam translation, published from Pampakuda, 1976.
112 Cf Is.6.1-3; Heb.12.22-23; Ps.148.1-2; Rev.4.6-8.

> with two wings cover their faces, with two (their) feet, and with two do fly one to another with mouths unceasing and with unsilenced divine words a hymn of victory of great beauty, with glorious voice hymning and shouting and crying and saying: (*People*) **Holy, Holy, Holy . . .** '.[113]

Enumerating the different angelic choirs is a characteristic of the antiochene anaphora. Similar listing is already attested by **MC** and **AC**.

Mystagogues have always carefully expounded the significance of sanctus. Bar Kepha gives an elaborate commentary:

> 'Concerning that which he says about the seraphim, that each one of them has six wings, and with "two they cover their face, and with two they hide their feet, and with two they fly", crying to him (a hymn of) praise, which is "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord (of) Sabaoth": By covering their faces they signify that God is eternal, and without beginning. By hiding their feet they show that God is without beginning. By hiding their feet they show that God is without end and without limit. By flying with two wings and praising, they signify that to him who is without beginning and without end praise is due from all. By singing three times "Holy, Holy, Holy", they signify that this God, who had no beginning and has no end, is three persons. By saying "Lord", they show that these three persons are one nature and one Lord. By saying "Almighty", they signify that his exalted power brought the universe into being, and that he holds and preserves it by his care. By saying "Sabaoth", they signify that he is Lord of hosts: for so the Hebrews interpret "Sabaoth" that is "hosts". And hence the seraphim sing thus: "Lord Almighty of hosts".'[114]

The sanctus is completed with the people's response:

> 'Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty,
> Heaven and earth are full of his glories.
> Hosanna in the highest.
> Blessed is he who has come and is to come in the name of the Lord.
> Hosanna in the highest.'

Most of the ancient anaphoras have retained the Hebrew word *Sabaoth* (= hosts). Thus we find it in **MC**, **AC** and **GrJ**. **SyJ** used by Bar Kepha also had it. But none of the known manuscripts of **SyJ** contains this word. All the manuscripts give *môr'ô hâiltônô* (= Lord Almighty), the Peshitta rendering of *Sabaoth* (cf.Is.6.3).

The people's response might be a combination of Is.6.3 and Matt 21.9 ('Blessed is he . . .'). While the Syriac gives 'he who has come and is to come' (already in **MbK**), the Greek has 'he who comes and will come'.[115]

AC has a simple formula: 'Holy, Holy, Holy (is) the Lord of Sabaoth, the heaven and earth are full of his glory: blessed are you for ever' (VIII,12,27). The last formula has been taken over from Ez.3.12. Theodore of Mopsuestia quotes

113 Heiming, **AS.II**-ii, 142.
114 **MbK**, 48-49.
115 *'d-ôtê*: (he who) is to come' is the Peshitta reading in Matt.21.8, Mk. 11.9; Lk.19.35; Ps.118.26.

only Is.6.3. Thus we can assume that originally the people's response consisted of the Isaiah text, which was expanded in the course of time. Though the people's response in **SyJ** remained unchanged, the wording of the pre-sanctus varies in different manuscripts.

In **MC** and **AC**, the sanctus was addressed to the Father in perfect accord with early Judeo-Christian tradition.[116] But in the context of the fourth century theological controversies, sanctus was interpreted as a doxology addressed to the Trinity. Theodore of Mopsuestia was one of the earliest commentators to follow this line.[117] Also in the fourth century, sanctus was given a Christological interpretation, apparently as an anti-Arian measure.[118] The Christological text of Matt 21.9 was attached to the sanctus to bring out the Christological meaning. This might have been first done in Antioch. The Christological sanctus serves as an introduction to the post-sanctus, which narrates Christ's incarnation.

In the West Syrian tradition, **MbK** combines different interpretations of the sanctus. After having given a Trinitarian interpretation, Bar Kepha brings out the Christological meaning:

> 'Isaiah aforetime saw one of the Holy Trinity, to wit the Son, who was to become man, sitting upon a high throne, and the Seraphim standing about him, etc. And by covering their faces they signify that they do not comprehend his eternity. By hiding their feet, they show they do not comprehend his becoming man. That they fly with two (wings): that is they praise and sanctify him continually. But by the three times that they cry to him "Holy", they declare that he is one of the three holy Persons. Again, by saying to him "Lord", they make known that he is equal in essence to the Father and to the Spirit. By saying to him "Almighty", they make known that he became man without change from being God, and conquered Satan and death, and redeemed the human race. All these things he did by his divine power.'[119]

H. POST-SANCTUS

The post-sanctus describes the divine economy and the redemption of man by the incarnation:

> 'In truth you are holy, O King of the worlds and giver of all holiness. Holy is your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and holy is your Holy Spirit who searches out your deep things, O God and Father. You are almighty, terrible, good, partaker of sufferings and especially towards your creation, who made man from the earth, having bestowed upon him the delight of paradise. But when he had transgressed your commandment and fallen, you did

116 For a study on the questions related to the sanctus: R Taft, 'The Interpolation of the Sanctus into the Anaphora: When and Where? A Review of the Dossier' in **OCP** 57(1991), 281-308; 58(1992), 83-121; cf B D Spinks, *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer* (Cambridge, 1991).

117 Theodore, *Eucharist*, Mingana, p 100-101.

118 Taft, 'The Interpolation of the Sanctus . ' in **OCP**, 58 (1992), 111-112.

119 **MbK**, 49. cf **DbS**, 11:4, p 62.

not disregard, you did not leave him, O good (one), but did chasten him as a father fair of mercies; having called him through the law, you did educate him through the prophets, and finally you did send your only begotten Son himself to the world, that you might renew your image; who when he had come down and was become incarnate of your Holy Spirit and of the holy, virgin, and blessed Mary, and had conversed with man, having accomplished (*dabar*) everything for the salvation of our race.'[120]

Creation and redemption are presented as the common work of the three divine persons. The operations of the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit cannot be understood in a chronological order. They are 'simultaneous' and 'concomitant'.

Earliest West Syrian anaphoras, such as **ATim** and John of Bosra, have a long and doctrinally rich post-sanctus, a tendency already attested in **AC**.[121] It is possible that, prior to the introduction of the creed, the post-sanctus or similar prayers may have served the credal purpose. The post-sanctus of **ATim** typifies the early West Syrian attempts to use the anaphora to communicate doctrine:

'In truth you are holy and blessed by all, O God the Father, and holy and blessed by all is your only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who was born ineffably before the world, who eternally holds the throne at right hand side of your majesty, and your Holy Spirit who is (also) holy and blessed by all, through whom all things of the earth and heaven are sanctified. And those who are near to you in heaven offer glory and honour, to your name and (you are) honoured by all, O King of the worlds. We therefore, your servants (who have) many sins, while answering with the heavenly armies, we praise, glorify, and bless and ask you for mercy (and say) our Saviour and God, have mercy upon us, reveal your merciful face to us and save us. For you are the one who had mercy upon our race and sent us your only begotten Son, Lord, who is our Saviour Jesus Christ, illuminator, benefactor, and redeemer of our souls and bodies, who was proclaimed by his holy prophets in the ancient days, when he was about to dwell among us, came in the end of time and took himself our humanity; the Word became flesh; he neither took change nor alteration, but by the Holy Spirit he was conceived by Mary, the ever-virgin and holy mother of God. (He took) a body having rational and intelligent soul, in true and hypostatical unity, which was not an imaginary apparition. Without separation or division, he truly took a human body and soul and all that a man has and in all things he resembled us except sin. He did not merely dwell among men, but while being perfect God the Word, he perfectly took flesh and became man. His divinity did not become humanity; but he remained in his divinity and took completely the human nature. He was not two, but one King, one Christ, one Lord, one God the Word incarnated who is revealed to us. He dwelt among

120 Heiming, **AS II-ii**, 142-144.
121 **AC** VIII, 12,28-34. cf **TD** I,23 (= Alcuin/GROW JLS 19, p 15-16) [**TD** has no sanctus].

men, affirmed the earth and blessed it; he restrained the waves of the sea. He was known with his deeds, revealed in power, conquered the human passions and put an end to the transgression of law, converted the erring, and destroyed the power of death from us, which conquered man in the beginning, and showed to be invincible in the end. Through the (human) body he caught hold of (the death) and that which was caught was destroyed. Through his death, he restored the glory of man who was destitute from glory.'[122]

Apparently **OSV** had a long post-sanctus, which was abridged in **NCR**. The post-sanctus of the West Syrian anaphoras generally gives a summary of the Trinitarian doctrine. Thus the anaphora of Dionysius Bar Salibi reads:

'Holy is the Father who is begetter, not begotten; holy is the Son who is begotten, not begetter; holy is the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and takes from the Son. One is the true God who redeemed us through his mercies and compassions.'[123]

Post-sanctus serves as an introduction to the institution narrative. **AC** and **GrJ** still attest to a stage in which the later separation of the institution from the sanctus and the post-sanctus has not yet taken place. Thus in St James the institution of the eucharist is presented as a turning point in the divine economy. Creation, God's great deeds in the Old Testament for the redemption of man, and finally the incarnation, are successive moments in the salvation history. The institution of the eucharist is part of God's loving care for humanity and his desire to 'renew his image that was impaired in mankind'.[124]

J. INSTITUTION NARRATIVE

The account of the institution is simply an historical narrative, not a consecratory formula.[125] In the institution, we commemorate and narrate the institution of the eucharist by Christ in the culmination of his public ministry, so revealing the meaning of his salvific death. Thus in its celebration the church proclaims the origin of the eucharist and the reason for its offering. This has been clearly stated by Bar Salibi:

122 **ATim**, **AS**.I-i, 16-18. cf 'Anaphora of the Patriarch John I' in H.Fuchs (ed) *Die Anaphora der monophysitischen Patriarchen Johannan I* (Münster in West, 1926) p 12-16.

123 Pampakuda (1986) p 134. The post-sanctus of the anaphora of John of Haran (falsely attributed to St John Chrysostom), is a glorification of the Father: 'O King of Kings and God the Father, it is meet and due (to offer) all the glorification to you with the Son and the Spirit'. (*ibid.* p 144).
The anaphora of Abraham the Hunter (*Nâhshirtônô*) is an example of introducing prayers without having a sense of their function and meaning: 'Restrain the uncontrollable hymns of our minds and sanctify them, so that we may be purified from sinful passions.' (*ibid.* p 252.)

124 Post-sanctus of St James: version published by Samuel Athanasisus.

125 Cf Isaq Saka, *Fûshoq Qûrôbô* (Zahle, Lebanon, 1963) p 73: quoted by Khouri-Sarkis, **OS**.XII-2 (1967), 160 (article A Cody, n 11). See the review of this book by Khouri-Sarkis, **OS** XI-3(1966), 380-7. Khouri-Sarkis argues that, for the Syrians, the words of institution have consecratory value. **OS**.XII-2, 160-163.

> 'Here (the priest) narrates the mystical story and makes commemoration of the priestly sacrifice that our Lord accomplished in the upper-room, in the evening in which he was about to surrender for us. After having celebrated the Old Testament Passover, he fulfilled the high priestly order, and entrusted this service to his disciples.'[126]

According to Bar Kepha, the institution is not a prayer, nor a request, but a narrative. He disapproves of any 'Amen' after the signing of the bread:

> 'But . . . we must know that when the priest says here "and for life everlasting", it is not right that he should give occasion to the people to answer "Amen"; for it is not a prayer, or a request, but this place is a narrative; and it is on account of a prayer that the people ought to answer "Amen"; but not on account of a narrative.'[127]

The institution narrative is in fact an 'anamnesis', a re-presentation of the Last Supper. In the person of the priest, Christ himself pronounces the sacramental words. Severus of Antioch says:

> 'You should know that the priest who offers, represents the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; for he in fact celebrates the memory of the sacrifice which he himself instituted, and of that which he himself began in the mysterious supper.'[128]

In his letter to Misael the deacon, Severus writes:

> 'It is not the offerer himself who, as by his own power and virtue, changes the bread into Christ's body, and the cup of blessing into Christ's blood, but the God-befitting and efficacious power of the words which Christ who instituted the mystery commanded to be pronounced over the things that are offered. The priest who stands before the altar, since he fulfils a mere ministerial function, pronouncing his words as in the person of Christ, and carrying back the rite that is being performed to the time at which he began the sacrifice for his apostles, says over the bread, "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me": while over the cup again he pronounces the words, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Lk 22.19-20). Accordingly it is Christ who still even now offers, and the power of his divine words perfects the things that are provided so that they may become his body and blood.'[129]

These words do not imply that Severus' teaching was similar to the Latin doctrine of consecration by the 'Words of Institution'. In fact they were directed against those who attributed a special sanctity to the eucharist offered by certain monks and bishops. Severus corrects them and says that the sanctity of the

126 **DbS** 12:1, p 65.
127 **MbK**, 56.
128 Letter 105, To Caesarea the Hypatissa, PO.XIV, 256.
129 Severus, *Select Letters*, II-1, p 238. In another letter Severus says: 'For it is Christ himself and his mysterious words which are pronounced over the bread and the cup of blessing that complete the rational and bloodless sacrifice, not the priest who stands before the altar.' (*ibid*, 245).

eucharistic celebration does not depend on the quality or saintliness of the celebrant, as Christ himself sanctifies the eucharist. However, Severus insists on the role of the Holy Spirit in the celebration:

> 'It is not the man who offers the sacrifice, but Christ completes it through the words uttered by the offerer and changes the bread into flesh and cup into blood, by the power, inspiration and grace of the Holy Spirit.'[130]

The West Syrian writers had always pointed out the presence and the operation of the Holy Spirit as the essential condition for the consecration; but they had almost never identified a single moment of tranformation with any particular element of the anaphora. Institution and epiclesis are mutually complementary. Bar Salibi writes:

> '(The priest) recites the words that our Lord said in the upper-room when he accomplished the mystery. By these (words), he indicates that he is the one who consecrates now as well as these elements which are placed on the altar, by the will of the Father and by the operation of the Spirit, through the priest who signs crosses and recites the words. It is not the one who ministers, but the one who is invoked on the mysteries, who consecrates. Again the bread receives the first sign (*rusmo*) of consecration through the signing (*hatmo*) of the crosses. It symbolizes the mystical consecration which was accomplished on that evening in the upper-room. Again the sign (*hatmo*) of the crosses symbolizes him who consecrates the offered gifts by the will of his Father and by the operation of the Spirit.'[131]

Now let us come to the institution narrative of St James:

> 'When he was about to accept a voluntary death for us sinners, himself without sin, in the same night in which he was delivered up for the life and salvation of the world, he took bread in his holy spotless and pure hands and showed it to you, God and Father, and when he had given thanks, he blessed, sanctified, broke (and) gave to his disciples and apostles, saying: "Take, eat of it all of you. This is my body which for you and for many is broken and given for the remission of sins and for eternal life." (Amen). Likewise the cup also, after they had supped, having mingled wine and water, he gave thanks, blessed, sanctified (and) gave to his disciples and apostles saying: "Take, drink of it all of you. This is my blood of the new covenant which for you and for many is shed and given for the remission of sins and for eternal life."'[132]

Later manuscripts have abridged the narrative, by omitting adjectives ('holy', 'spotless', 'pure') or minor details ('showed it to you', 'after he had supped', 'when mixed with wine and water' etc.). A narrative that was abridged rather freely means that the West Syrians have never attributed any 'exaggerated significance' to it.

130 Letter to Ammian and Epagathus, *Select Letters*, II-1, p 234-35.
131 **DbS** 12:4, p 65.
132 Heiming, **AS.II**-ii, 145-146.

MC is silent on the institution narrative. Whether the Jerusalem anaphora contained a narrative or not is beyond the scope of this book. However, the influence of the antiochene anaphora on the institution narrative is evident. Thus the expressions, 'the night in which he was betrayed', 'holy and undefiled hands', 'looking up to you his God and Father and mixing (the cup of) wine and water' are found in **AC**.

The narrative in its present form (with a few variants) agrees with the Georgian, Ethiopian and the Armenian versions, as well as with the oldest known text of **SyJ**.[133] Though **SyJ** served as the model and source for most of the West Syrian anaphoras, there is considerably diverse wording in the institution narrative.[134] It was freely revised several times, and it is difficult to trace its evolution. **JEGS** cites an institution narrative that does not correspond completely to the **NCR**:

> ""Then he took bread and said . . . he looked at heaven" to show the will of God and "gave thanks" (that is) confession, not petition and neither prayer, nor consent. And that "I confess (you)" ("*mâwdé ʿanô*") means that "I entrust (myself) to your will (and) I receive the suffering and death". That "he blessed and sanctified" (means) he sanctified it and that "he broke" that he offered himself to him; "divided", that is, the remission of sins proceeded from it. (And) "he gave to them" (means that) the gift is from him.
>
> 'Some people say that he did not eat from his body and others (say) that indeed he ate. Mar Ephrem says: "They ate his body and he (ate) with them; they drank his blood and he (also) drank his blood and he made themselves equal to them". And St John (Chrysostom) says: "After having tasted, he gave (it) to his disciples" (fol.182r).'

JEGS has three phrases not found in **NCR** (which follows **GrJ**): 'He looked at heaven', 'I confess you' and '(he) divided'. Though the first is attested in a manuscript of **NCR** (BM.add 14691), the second and the third are not found in any of the known manuscripts of **SyJ**. The first and the third are found in a few West Syrian anaphoras, while the second ('I confess') is absent in all known texts of the anaphoras.[135]

Then **JEGS** refers to an early Syro-antiochene tradition that Christ ate his body at the Last Supper. The author appeals to the authority of St Ephrem and St John Chrysostom.[136] Moses Bar Kepha and Bar Salibi (who quote from **JEGS**) refer to it.[137]

133 Heiming, **OCP** 16 (1950), 190-200. On the variant readings see Tarby, 56-60. On the possible sources see Fenwick, *Basil and James*, 126-146.

134 Cf A Raes, 'Les paroles de la consécration dans les anaphores syriennes' in **OCP** 3 (1937), 486-504.

135 'He looked at heaven' is attested in the anaphoras of John the Evangelist and Mark the Evangelist. 'Divided' is found in Severus of Antioch, Gregory of Naziansus, Jacob of Serugh (ii) and the Catholicos Marutha.

136 P Yousif says that he did not find even a single text in this regard in the writings of Ephrem. Cf *L'eucharistie chez Saint Ephrem de Nisibe*, OCA 224 (Rome, 1984) 214. However, this may be implied in the Paschal hymn (19) of Ephrem: 'Il immola la pâque et (en) mangea et il rompit son corps'. Quoted by Yousif, p 131. Chrysostom: 'Believe that even now this is the meal (the farewell meal of Jesus) of which he himself partook' (*In Math. Hom)* 50,3, PG 58:507. cf Irenaeus, *Ad.Haer.* V, 35; Philoxenos of Mabbug, Fragment 30, Matt.26.26-29 (ed. J W Watt), CSCO 393 (1978), 30.

137 **MbK**, 53; **DbS**, 12:6, p 67

The anaphoras attributed to the Twelve Apostles (II) Jacob of Edessa also speak of this tradition in their institution narratives.[138] Does it mean that the **SyJ** known to Jacob of Edessa contained a reference to this tradition?

K. ANAMNESIS

The anamnesis continues the words of institution. The anaphora as a whole is an anamnesis of the 'great things that Christ has done for us'.[139] In anamnesis, the whole divine economy is recalled, 're-presented' or made 'contemporaneous'. Thus the members of the body of Christ become co-participants in the history of salvation.

The meaning of the anamnesis is as an integral part of the proclamation of God's loving kindness towards humanity that begins in the post-sanctus. After the blessing of the bread and wine, the text proceeds:

Priest: Do this in remembrance of me as often as you partake of this sacrament, commemorating my death and my resurrection, until I come.

People: **Your death, O Lord, we commemorate; your resurrection we confess, and your second coming we look for. May your mercy be upon all.**

Priest: Remembering therefore, O Lord, your death and your resurrection on the third day from among the dead, and your ascension into heaven and your session at the right hand of God, and your terrible and glorious second coming wherein you are about to judge the world in righteousness and reward every one according to his deeds: we offer you this fearful and bloodless sacrifice, that you would not deal with us according to our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities, but according to your mildness and love for mankind, blot out our sins, your suppliants. For your people and your inheritance beseech you, and through you to your Father, saying.

People: **Have mercy upon us, O God, Father Almighty.**[140]

It is significant that the anamnesis evokes the death, resurrection, ascension, the second coming and the last judgment. In a sacramental celebration, we commemorate past events as well as the events to take place. In the eucharist, we participate not only in the sacrifice of Christ, but we get also the foretaste of the world to come in which we will experience the fullness of the divine presence and the life 'without tears and fear'. Anamnesis is the 'actualization' or 're-presentation' of the things that took place, and that will take place.[141]

138 **APSyr, AS 1-ii** (1940) 244; Jacob of Edessa, **AS III-i**, 56

139 Cf **JETh**: 'The (content) of the whole *qûrôbô* is to remember and to recount all (things) which Christ has done for us.' (**DbS**, 3:4, p 10).

140 **AS.II-i**, 148. cf Samuel Athanasius, 40.

141 Cf Theodore of Mopsuestia: 'We perform, therefore, this ineffable sacrament (*rozo*) which contains the incomprehensible signs of the economy of Christ our Lord, as we believe that the things implied in it will happen to us'. (*Hom.on Baptism*, ed. Mingana) p 20

In West Syrian anaphoras, including **SyJ**, the anamnesis has been addressed to the Son (a feature already attested in **TD**). In Greek and Georgian, it has been addressed to the Father. Ethiopian and Armenian (only the people's response) follow Syriac. Originally the anamnesis must have been addressed to the Father as a prelude to the epiclesis, and the West Syrians might have modified it, most probably, following an early Syro-mesopotamian pattern. Thus **TD**, the East Syrian Addai and Mari (only partly) and the Maronite Peter Sharar have retained this feature. We have evidence that, as late as the ninth century, West Syrian anaphoras contained prayers addressed to the Son. Thus Moses Bar Kepha directs a major change in the anaphoras: if prayers of the anaphora, except the final thanksgiving prayer, are not addressed to the Father, they should be corrected.[142] As already noted, the prayer said instead of the ante-pax in the passion-week is still addressed to the Son. The Christological reasons also could not be excluded. One of the concerns of the redactors of **NCR** may have been to make the prayers conform to the orientation of **GrJ**.

The anamnesis ends with a thanksgiving prayer addressed to the Father:

> 'We also, O Lord, your weak and sinful servants receiving your grace give thanks to you and praise you for all things and by reason of all things. (*People*): **Lord God, we glorify you, we bless you, we worship you and we beseech you for mercy. Have mercy upon us.**'

This is followed by the epiclesis.

L. EPICLESIS

The epiclesis in its present form consists of four elements: (i) invocation of the Holy Spirit, said silently by the priest; (ii) the deacon's exhortation; (iii) priest's petition: 'Answer me, O Lord'; (iv) signing of the bread and wine.

Epiclesis and anamnesis are inseparable. In fact in most of the ancient anaphoras (**AC**, **TD**), epiclesis is given as the continuation of the anamnesis. It is the Holy Spirit who actualizes the events of salvation history that took place once for all. The 'anamnesis' or the re-presentation is effected by the Holy Spirit. We cannot identify the anamnesis with a particular moment, prayer, or rite of the anaphora. The anaphora as a whole is an 'anamnesis' and an 'invocation' of the Holy Spirit.

The epiclesis of **SyJ** evokes the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation and asks the Father 'to send down the Holy Spirit upon us and upon the offerings':

> '(*Silently*): Have mercy upon us, O God, almighty Father, and send (*sadar*) upon us and upon these offerings that are placed, your Holy Spirit, the Lord and life-giver, who is equal to you in throne, God the Father and to the Son and equal in kingdom, consubstantial and co-eternal, who spoke in the law and the prophets, and in your new covenant, who descended in the likeness of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, who descended upon your holy apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues. [*Ekphonesis*: Answer me, O Lord ; *People*: **Kyrie eleison** . . .].

142 **MbK**, 89-90.

'(*And he raises his voice*): So that overshadowing (*kad magen*) he may make (*nebed*) this bread the life-giving body, the redeeming body, the heavenly body, the body which frees our souls and bodies, the body of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive. (*People*: **Amen**).

'And the mixture which is in this cup, he may make (*nebed*) the blood of the new covenant, the redeeming blood, the life-giving blood, the heavenly blood, the blood which frees our souls and bodies, the blood of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life for those who receive,

'That they may be to all who partake of them the sanctification of the souls and bodies, the bearing of fruits of good works, for the confirmation of your holy church which you had founded upon the rock of faith and the gates of hell shall not overcome her against it, delivering her from all heresy and from the stumbling blocks of them that work lawlessness, even unto the end of the world: both now and at all times and to the ages of ages. **Amen**.'[143]

It is interesting to compare the Syriac text with the Greek, given below:

'. . . and send out (*exaposteilon*) upon us and upon the holy gifts set before you, your all-Holy Spirit himself (encomium of the Spirit) . . . Send down (*katapempson*), Master, your all-Holy Spirit himself upon us and upon these gifts set before you, that he may descend (*epiphoitesan*) upon them and by his holy and good and glorious coming (*parousia*) he may sanctify (*hagiasen*) and make (*poise*) this bread the holy body of Christ (**Amen**), and this cup the precious blood of Christ (**Amen**).'[144]

In both Greek and Syriac, the epiclesis is addressed to the Father to send (*exapostello*) the Holy Spirit, a general feature attested since the end of the fourth century. **MC** also uses this word in its reference to the epiclesis. In Syriac it is *sâdâr* (from *sdr* = to send).[145] The verb *sâdâr* is henceforth a key word in the West Syrian epicleses to denote the movement of the Spirit in the sacraments. The Greek repeats the petition to 'send down' (*katapempo*) the Holy Spirit. Since the second petition is absent in other versions, we can assume that it was added later. The Greek uses a third verb *epiphoitao*, a word frequently used of the Spirit's activity in liturgical and patristic texts. In Syriac it becomes 'overshadow(ing)' (*kâd mâgên*).

Epiphoitao is not found in the Bible. In the Syriac (Peshitta) New Testament, *âgên* has been used to render two key Greek verbs: *episkiazein* (Lk 1.35: 'overshadow') and *skenoo* (Jn 1.14 : 'tabernacle').[146] Through **SyJ** the word *âgên*

143 Heiming, **AS.II-ii**, 150152..

144 Mercier, PO.26, 204-205.

145 For a study of the epiclesis in St James, see B Varghese, *Theological significance of the Epiklesis in the Liturgy of Saint James* (forthcoming); B D Spinks, 'The consecratory Epiklesis of the Anaphora of Saint James' in *Studia Liturgica* 11 (1976), 19-38. On the use of the verb *exapostello*, *ibid*. 31-32.

146 Also used in Acts 10.44 and 11.15 to render *epipipto*, and in Acts 5.15 and 2 Cor 1.19 for *episkenoo*. For the use of the verb *âgên*, cf S Brock, *The Holy Spirit in the Syrian Baptismal Tradition* (Kottayam, 1979) 6-7

has entered the West Syrian epiclesis.[147] Later West Syrian anaphoras modelled on St James use *râhêf* (= 'to hover'; derived from Gen.1.2; Dt.32.11) or its derivative nouns to describe the descent of the Spirit. In its Old Testament use, *râhêf* (= 'hovering', 'brooding over', 'overshadowing', 'indwelling', 'tabernacling') implies the life-giving presence of the Spirit. In fact *râhêf* has been more influential in the history of the West Syrian liturgy than *âgên*. Thus after the twelfth century, the use of *râhêf* gave rise to a symbolic waving of the hands over the elements during the epiclesis. This gesture has been extended to the epicleses in the consecration of baptismal water, the consecration of *myron* (oil) and ordination. A three-fold waving of the right hand (or hands) followed by three signs of the cross has become the essential part of the blessing of the objects. Thus the particular meaning of the Syriac verbs *âgên* or *râhêf* got its permanent ritual expression in the West Syrian tradition.

St Ephrem is the earliest writer to use *râhêf* to describe the descent of the Spirit upon the bread and wine: 'The priest places the bread and wine upon which [the Holy Spirit] has not yet descended (*rûhôfô*)'.[148] On the other hand, the waving of the hands could be a modification of the signing of the cross over the elements; and **JETh** refers to the signs of the cross over the bread and wine.[149] However, it is doubtful whether the waving of the hands was introduced before the thirteenth century. Thus Jacob of Edessa, **MbK** and **DbS**, though speaking of the signs of the cross, are silent on this gesture.

Originally the signing of the cross was done during the prayer: 'May the Holy Spirit descend and make this bread . . . this cup . . .'. But currently the priest waves his hands over the paten and chalice during the first part of the epiclesis (saying the prayer silently), and then concludes the epiclesis with a three-fold signing (with the right hand) over the paten and chalice separately. Gradually the waving was extended to the silent recitals of the prayer of the offering and the post-sanctus. The waving during the post-sanctus (during which the people chant the sanctus) could be an imitation of the angels 'who fly one to another'.

Though the West Syrian authors are not precise about the nature of the change, they do compare the 'transformation' of the bread and wine with the incarnation, especially with the conception of the Word by the Virgin. Thus Bar Kepha writes:

> 'It is right that we enquire here concerning the Holy Spirit, why he comes down upon the bread and wine which are set upon the altar. Lo, we know that the Son comes down upon the bread and wine and is united to them hypostatically: but the Holy Spirit, why does he come down? We say, for this reason: as he came down into the womb of the holy Virgin—according as the angel said: "The Holy Spirit shall come *etc.*" (Lk.1.35) and made the

147 Cf S Brock, 'The Background to some terms in the Syriac Eucharistic Epikleses' in *The Harp* XI-XII (1998-99), 1-12 (here 8-10).
148 Memra on the Priesthood: I Fast, p viii
149 **DbS** 3:8, p 12.

> body which was from the Virgin the body of God the Word—so he comes down upon the bread and wine which are upon the altar, and makes them the body and blood of God the Word which was from the Virgin.
> 'Again, we say thus: just as in the case of the holy Virgin Mary, the Father willed that the Son should become incarnate, but the Son came down into the womb of the Virgin and became incarnate, and the Spirit also came down to the Virgin and caused the Son to be incarnate of her: so here also in the case of the altar: the Father wills that the Son be united hypostatically to the bread and wine, and that they become his body and his blood; but the Son comes down that he may be hypostatically united to them; and the Spirit also comes down that he may unite them to him, even as he caused him to be incarnate of the Virgin.'[150]

Deacon's exhortation: As the priest waves his hands over the elements and silently recites the epiclesis, the deacon exhorts:

> 'How awful is this hour and how perturbed this time, my beloved ones, wherein the Holy Spirit from the topmost heights of heaven takes wing and descends, and broods and rest upon this eucharist here present and hallows it. In calm and in awe were you, standing and praying.'

Originally the exhortation consisted of a simple command—'In silence and in fear be standing'—attested by **MbK**, **ApSyr** and a few manuscripts of **SyJ**. By the time of Bar Salibi, the exhortation had been expanded. Bar Kepha explains it:

> 'That is; he summons the people for the lighting down of the Holy Spirit, that their standing may be such that they have these two things: first, silence, because the gifts of the Holy Spirit are given in silence; secondly, fear, lest any outcry be made by them, and that happen to them which happened to the Israelites in Mount Sinai, who said to Moses: "Speak with us yourself, and let not God speak to us, lest we die".'[151]

The people's response: 'May peace be with us and tranquillity unto us all' is not attested by the commentators and the ancient manuscripts.

Genuflection: We have evidence that in some places the priest made a genuflection during the first part of the epiclesis and stood up and said the second part was aloud.[152] **ApSyr** refers to this: 'We ask you therefore, almighty Lord and God of the holy powers, falling on our faces before you, that you send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts set before you.'[153] An eighth-century manuscript of **SyJ** also speaks of the genuflection.[154] However, this was not a widespread custom. Thus **MbK** and **DbS** are silent on it. The normal practice was to recite the invocation inaudibly in an inclined position.

Answer me, O Lord, and have mercy on me: after having completed the silent recital, the celebrant says aloud thrice: 'Answer me'. It is attested by

150 **MbK** 59-60.
151 *Ibid.* 59.
152 Cf G Khouri-Sarkis, 'L'incise "Exauce-moi" dans les Epicleses syriennes' in OS III-3 (1958), 337-358; here p 352ff.
153 **ApSyr.AS.I-ii** (1940), 218. Eng.tr. Jasper-Cuming, 127.
154 Connolly, *St James*, 97. cf Khouri-Sarkis, *L'incise*, 342ff.

MbK, but became widespread much later.[155] It is absent from the text edited by O.Heiming and from most ancient manuscripts. Bar Salibi treats it as a new practice: 'In the West, according to a new custom, which is existing today . . . the priest says in Syriac "Lord, answer me and have mercy upon me". Then the people say three times "Kyrie Eleison", that is, "Lord, have mercy upon us".'[156]

Here 'West' refers to the Patriarchate of Antioch. Thus the exclamation may have originated in the 'East', probably in Mosul, and was adopted in the 'West' by the twelfth century. Unlike John of Dara, **MbK** and **DbS** do not say that the exclamation was made thrice. **MbK** and Dara knew the plural form (us), against the singular form (me) attested by Bar Salibi and the later texts. The petition was changed into the singular, probably to make it conform to 1 Kings 18.37 (Peshitta).

The exclamation followed by the people's response has divided the epiclesis into two parts. Its origin is still obscure. As we have seen, the celebrant bowed down or bent down during the epiclesis. When the number of the anaphoras increased, it was practically impossible for a priest to learn all the diverse epicleses by heart. Thus the priest might have recited the exclamation during the genuflection. When the genuflection had disappeared, the exclamation continued to be said as part of the invocation.[157]

Some priests used to strike their breast with their hands as they said 'Have mercy upon us'. John of Dara speaks of it as a normal custom, while Bar Kepha censures it.[158]

Conclusion of the Epiclesis: The epiclesis ends with this supplication:

> '(We pray you, O Lord), that they (= the holy mysteries) may be to all who partake of them the sanctification of the souls and bodies, the bearing of fruits of good works, for the confirmation of your holy church which you had founded upon the rock of faith and the gates of hell shall not overcome her against it, delivering her from all heresy and from the stumbling blocks of them that work lawlessness, even unto the end of the world . . .' (**AS.II-ii**,152)

In the course of time, this concluding part has been presented as detached from the text of the epiclesis. This disintegration is not found in **GrJ**, and the pre-tenth century manuscripts of **SyJ**, including the one published by Heiming (= **AS**).

The Holy Spirit, who descends upon the elements and upon the community, transforms the gifts into the body and blood of Christ, so that they may become means 'for the remission of sins, eternal life and the sanctification of the souls and bodies and the bearing of the good works' for those who partake of them. In fact these are the results of communion with Christ in the Holy Spirit. The Spirit comes not for the well being of the faithful and the church, but to the very being of the church. The Spirit sanctifies the faithful, and thus confirms the church and protects her from all divisions and heresies. This is, in fact, the result of our life in Christ that the Spirit grants us.

155 cf Khouri-Sarkis, *ibid.*
156 **DbS** 14:10, p 77.
157 This is the explanation given by Khouri-Sarkis, which seems to be reasonable. *L'incise.*
158 John of Dara, 4:14, p 80; **MbK**, 61-62.

3.
Intercessions

M. SIX-FOLD CANONS

The epiclesis is followed by the great intercession, also known as 'diptychs', 'commemorations' or 'canons'. The intercessions consist of 18 prayers, arranged in six canons, each of three prayers: one by the deacon, during which the celebrant says a prayer (on the same theme) inaudibly. It is followed by an *ekphonesis* by the celebrant. Among the six canons, the first three commemorate the living and the last three the departed. Their arrangement is as follows: 1: Orthodox prelates. 2: Living brethren. 3: Kings and rulers. 4. Apostles and saints. 5: Doctors of the church. 6: Faithful departed.

Apparently the six-fold division was introduced after the time of Jacob of Edessa. In **GrJ** and **ApSyr**, the intercessions are still a single prayer. The deacon's canons and the *oratio secreta* were obviously absent in the earliest known manuscripts of **SyJ**. Most probably, in **JEGS** the commemorations of which Jacob speaks consisted of a single prayer, for he writes thus: 'Then the commemorations of the church and its ranks: shepherds, priests, kings, apostles, prophets, fathers, martyrs and all the saints, mother of God and the departed.'[159] In **JETh**, he writes:

> 'Following (the epiclesis the priest) makes also commemorations, and thus completes the *qûrôbô* . . . The order of the commemorations begins as we say: "Again we offer you the same awesome and bloodless sacrifice . . ." Again you should know that the canons to be said by the deacons need not be said by the priest, if no deacon is present.'[160]

Jacob's view that the canons can be omitted if there is no deacon, implies that they were a new addition. However, it is not clear whether the six-fold division was known to him.

Despite the introduction of the commemorations—obviously under the influence of St James—in several dioceses and monasteries of the Syrian Orthodox Church, the Book of Life continued to be read at the beginning of the anaphora.[161] Most probably, George, bishop of the Arabs, knew only the Book of Life. But Bar Kepha comments on both the Book of Life and the six-fold canons, and was the first to speak of the six-fold division and also of the *oratio secreta*.[162]

Evidences suggest that the six-fold division was introduced in the eighth/ ninth centuries. Some bishops did not hide their opposition to the new practice. Thus Lazar Bar Sabta, who was deposed from the see of Baghdad in 829 by the Patriarch Dionysius Tell-Mahre, disapproved of reciting an *ekphonesis*, then an

159 Berlin Sachau 218, fol.182v. This sequence does not correspond to the present canons of **SyJ** and to **ApSyr.**
160 **DbS**, 3: 5-7, p 10-12.
161 On the Book of Life see: R Taft, *The Diptychs* (OCA 238, Rome, 1991), 71-76; R H Connolly, 'The Book of Life' in *JTS* 13 (1912), 580-594; A Palmer, 'The Book of Life in Syriac Liturgy: An Instrument of Social and Spiritual Survival' in *The Harp* IV (1991), 161-171. The Book of Life has been edited by Connolly-Codrington.
162 **MbK** 63-64.

oratio secreta and the canons. According to him, this will 'distort and interrupt the sense of the commemorations' and he writes:

> 'Then the priest continues to respond for the church: "We offer you this sacrifice for your church in the whole universe *etc.*", and he continues until the memento of the priests, deacons and brothers. But all these *ekphoneses* that are placed among the commemorations from the phrase, "Deliver us, Lord, from all misery" to the end of the last prayer which begins: "Nobody is exempted from sin", all clearly seem to distort and interrupt the sense of the commemoration. In fact they are interpolations, additions. Therefore the whole commemorations should (consist of) one *ekphonesis* and one *oratio secreta*. All other *ekphoneses* and their prayers could be left out.'[163]

This seems to be a protest against the introduction of the six-fold canons. Bar Kepha's comments suggest that, if the Book of Life is read (at the beginning of the anaphora), the canons (or parts of them) can be left out:

> 'It is right to know that the diptychs which the deacon proclaims are six, three of the living and three of the dead. And whenever the Book of Life is not read upon the altar, it is not right for him to omit anything from them . . .'[164]

That the six-fold canons are a new introduction is further suggested by the confusion of the people regarding the appropriate response. Bar Kepha directs the people to say 'Kyrie eleison' instead of 'For all and because of all', which was the response to the reading of the Book of Life. He refers to the practices of the 'West' as an example to be followed.[165]

The commemoration is an essential element of the anaphora. We commemorate in one way or other events (creation and redemption in Christ) as well as names. Anaphora is the prayer *par excellence* of the church. The church commemorates the whole humanity, because it brings 'help' for all in need (**MC**.V,8). Cyril of Jerusalem says why we pray for the departed: 'Then we commemorate also those who have fallen asleep . . . believing that it will be a very great benefit to the souls, for whom the supplication is put up, while that holy and most awful sacrifice is set forth' (**MC**.V,9).

Commemoration is also an act of communion. In a sacramental celebration, when we 'commemorate' an event, or a reality, we are made participants in it. Thus Cyril says that we chant sanctus so that 'we may be partakers with the hosts of the world above in their hymn of praise' (**MC**.V,6). In the tradition of the undivided church, the reading of the names of the prelates in the diptychs is considered as an act of communion. Similarly the commemoration of the names of the departed saints, fathers and doctors implies that the eucharist is celebrated in communion with them and as part of a tradition of which they are the privileged witnesses.

The canons that the deacon recites are not fixed and final. In fact the Syrian Orthodox Church has several collections of canons, most of which are no more in use.

163 Quoted by Rahamani (from BM.add 17128), *Liturgies*, 228.
164 **MbK**, 63.
165 *Ibid*, 64.

4.
Preparation for Communion

N. RITES BEFORE THE FRACTION

The intercessions are followed by a greeting of peace and a benediction in the name of the Son. The eucharist consists of four actions that go back to the Last Supper: (Jesus) took, blessed, broke and gave. The preparation rites correspond to the first action (took), the anaphora to the second (blessed), the fraction to the third and communion to the fourth. In **SyJ**, the significance of the last three actions (blessed, broke, gave) has been brought out. Each of them is introduced with a greeting of peace then a benediction. The second and the fourth are preceded by Trinitarian blessings, the third with a benediction in the name of Christ: 'May the mercy of God the great and our Saviour Jesus Christ be with you all, my brethren, forever.' The fraction is interpreted, in both the rite and the commentaries, in terms of the passion and death of Christ, which may account for giving the benediction in the name of Christ.

In **AC**, the intercessions are followed by pax and a litany by the deacon. In **GrJ** the order is Trinitarian benediction-pax-litany. The benediction both in Syriac and in Greek seems to be a later addition.

P. FRACTION

Immediately after the benediction, the curtain is drawn, a practice attested by Bar Kepha.[166] It was after the twelfth century that the 'order of breaking and signing' became complex. The present rite consists of fraction, consignation and commixture. The signing of the bread with the wine is attested since the fourth century. St Ephrem is the earliest father to mention it: 'Behold, with the blood of the grapes your image has been painted on the bread and on (our) heart(s) by the index-finger of the Spirit with the colours of faith. Blessed is the one who effaced the images of paganism with the image of truth.'[167]

Theodore of Mopsuestia attests that a developed fraction existed in Antioch (or Mopsuestia) around 400 AD. **AC**, **TD** and **MC** do not speak of the fraction, probably considering it a purely utilitarian act. Surprisingly, **JEGS** sees it as a utilitarian act that precedes communion. **JETh** represents a later tradition. Bar Kepha is perhaps the earliest writer to comment on a developed practice, but he does not say whether the celebrant recited a long prayer during it. Most probably the fraction was performed with a simple formula, during which the deacon read *katholike*, a common prayer similar to the litany in **AC**. Thus Bar Kepha, John of Dara and Bar Salibi refer to *katholike*. According to Bar Kepha, *katholike* was introduced 'so that the minds of the people may not wander in silence now that the priest is completing the service of the mysteries'.[168] He adds that many

166 **MbK**, 66-67.
167 Quoted by Rahmani, *Liturgies*, 235.
168 **Mbk**, 72.

katholike are in use. Lazar Bar Sabta of Baghdad (ninth century) says that in some places Ps.118 was sung in the place of *katholike*, and that it was an ancient custom.[169]

Originally, *katholike* had nothing to do with the fraction. In **AC**, the intercessions were followed by a universal prayer (*katholike*).[170] Then communion was given. We can assume that during the *katholike* the celebrant broke the bread into pieces as communion followed. The *katholike* became known as the normal prayer that accompanies the fraction. At least until the eleventh century, in several dioceses, there was a simple formula: 'We break the heavenly bread and sign the holy chalice in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.'[171] The phrase 'heavenly bread' became the subject of a heated controversy in the Syrian Orthodox Church between 750 and 850. Bar Salibi summarizes the controversy:

> 'When the deacon reads the *katholike*, the priest takes the bread in the hands silently and quietly, unlike the foolish people of Cyrrhus, who formerly taught that the priest shall cry out "We break the heavenly bread *etc*", before the deacon reads the *katholike*. The patriarch Giwargi and Cyriacus and the patriarch Dionysius and others opposed them. They demonstrated that, by these words, their teaching (= of the people of Cyrrhus) implies the opinion of Nestorius.'[172]

These patriarchs are Giwargis (758-790), Qiryaquos (793-817) and Dionysius of Tell Mahre (818-845). On the basis of the Chronicle of Dionysius Tell Mahre, Michel the Syrian records the development of the controversy.[173] The argument of the Patriarch Giwargis was as follows: After the consecration, the bread is to be called 'the body of Christ'. If it is qualified as 'heavenly bread', it would imply that it is something different from the 'body of Christ'. it would mean, he said, that Christ is divided, that is, he is confessed as two persons. The patriarch argued that this is another form of Nestorianism.[174]

It is significant that Bar Salibi writes: 'the priest takes the bread in his hands silently and quietly'. Thus in his days probably there was no other prayer during the fraction, except the *katholike*. So he may not be the author of the prayer of fraction known in his name. It may have been composed on the basis of his commentary, itself an adaptation of the work of Bar Kepha.

Fraction without any formula is attested in BM add17128 (tenth/eleventh century): 'The priest breaks silently the chosen bread [*prîstô*]. With this half he signs each of them. Then with the hands he breaks all the chosen breads into small pieces.'[175]

Usually the text of **SyJ** does not give the fraction rite, as it is the part of the *ordo communis* and common to all anaphoras. In most of the manuscripts we find the rubric: 'The priest breaks and signs (the bread). The deacon reads the *katholike*'.

169 Rahmani, *Liturgies*, 239-40.
170 **AC** VIII, 13.
171 **ATim. AS.I-I**, 40.
172 **DbS**, 16:1, p 85-86.
173 J B Chabot (ed), *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 3 vols (Paris, 1899-1905), III, 5-8.
174 On the controversy: cf Sauget, *Vestiges*, 335-344.
175 Add.17128, fol.38: cf G Khouri-Sarkis, **OS**.XII-2(1967), 171 (= note 19 to A A Cody's article).

In the present fraction rite, there are three prayers: (i) the prayer attributed to Bar Salibi; (ii) a hymn (*bo'ûtô*) of Jacob of Serugh; (iii) a group of three prayers of commixture. Several manuscripts contain only the hymn of Jacob of Serugh. However, since the fifteenth century, the manuscripts give all the three prayers.

Since the fourth century, the Syrian tradition saw the fraction as a type of the passion and death of Christ. Theodore and Narsai are among the earliest writers to relate the fraction in detail to the passion and death of Christ. This interpretation could go back to the undivided Syriac tradition of the fourth and the early fifth centuries. Among the West Syrians, Bar Kepha provided the best example of this approach:

> '(The priest) takes some of *prîstô* in his hands. And whereas he breaks it in two, he shows that God the Word truly suffered in the flesh and was sacrificed and broken on the cross. Whereas he takes some of the body and dips it in the blood, and brings some of it (the blood) and signs over the body, he shows that this slain one was besprinkled with his blood in the upper room when he said, "This is my blood", and on the cross when his side was pierced with a spear and there came forth from it blood and water, and he was besprinkled therewith. Again, whereas he brings some of the blood and signs the body, he makes a union of the soul with the body; and he shows that after the soul of the Word was separated from his body, his soul returned and was united to his body: howbeit his Godhead was in no wise separated either from his body or from his soul, neither can it be separated. And that bread is the body of God the Word, but the wine is his soul; for the blood is a symbol of the soul, as it is written: "The soul of all flesh is the blood".(Lev.17.11,14). But again, whereas, after he has signed (with) some of the blood over the body, he unites and fits together these two halves of the *prîstô* one with another, he symbolizes and shows by this that Emmanuel is one, and is not divided into two natures after the union. Again, he shows that, after he was sacrificed on the cross, he made all to be at peace by the blood of his cross, and united and joined together heavenly with earthly beings, and the people with the peoples, and the soul with the body. Again by fetching the *prîstô* about in a circle, he declares and signifies that he was sacrificed on the cross for the sin of the circle of the world. Why does he bring some of the body to the blood and sign, and not bring some of the body to the blood and sign? And we say, because the blood is the soul; and it was the soul that came and was united to the body when he rose from the dead, and the body did not go and be united to the soul.'[176]

The first prayer of fraction has faithfully retained the ideas of Bar Kepha. As already noted, Bar Salibi reproduced the text of Bar Kepha without much alteration and it may have inspired the first prayer. Bar Kepha writes on complex rites, which, most probably, existed in his days. We can assume that the complex rites have been inspired by the minute interpretations given to them. The West

176 **MbK**, 67-68. cf The prayer of fraction in Brightman, 97-99.

Syrians may have given interpretations that correspond to their Christology, and the complex rites might have arisen out of them. In other words, in the Syrian tradition, rites rarely preceded interpretations. But rather the commentaries gave birth to rubrics or gestures.

West Syrian rubrics direct to arrange the broken pieces in definite patterns (eg Lamb, Son of man, cross or angel), a custom that must have originated after the thirteenth century.[177] Bar Kepha instructs only to break the bread into small pieces to provide enough for all the faithful.[178] **JETh** refers to the signs of the cross on the bread and wine during the fraction.[179]

Q. THE LORD'S PRAYER

After the fraction, the curtain is withdrawn and then follows the Lord's Prayer, which is in fact, the preparation for communion. It is the prayer of the sons of God, who address God with 'unashamed faces': 'Abba, Father!' Thus Bar Kepha writes:

> '. . . God is said to be our Father by reason of baptism. For because we and Christ have been born from the one womb of legitimate baptism, we have hereby become his brethren and sons of his heavenly Father. For this is the rule touching those who are born from the same womb, that they are called brothers one of another, the sons of him who begot them. Hence God is called our Father, because he begot us from baptism by the Holy Spirit.'[180]

The use of the Lord's Prayer in the eucharist is first attested in **MC**. It is absent in **AC**, **TD** and probably in **JEGS**. Thus, most probably, the Lord's Prayer was absent in **OSV**.[181] In fact the Lord's Prayer is absent in the Syrian Orthodox baptismal liturgy, which owes its basic structure to the anaphora.

R. RITES BEFORE *SANCTA SANCTIS*

After the embolism of the Lord's Prayer, peace is greeted and the deacon exhorts: 'Before partaking of these divine and holy mysteries, that have been offered, let us bow down our heads before the merciful Lord.'

The exhortation originally consisted of a simple phrase: 'Before the Lord, let us bow down our hearts.'[182] However, the people's response 'Before you, our Lord and God' has remained virtually unchanged.[183] Then follows the

177 Cf P T Givergis Panicker, 'The Holy Qûrbônô in the Syro-Malankara Church' in J Madey (ed), *The Eucharistic Liturgy in the Christian East*, (Kottayam/Paderborn, 1982), 135-171 + appendix (gives the illustrations of different patterns).
178 **Mbk**, 68-69; **DbS**, 16:6, p 88.
179 **DbS**, 3:8, p 11-12. cfr. **MbK**, 70.
180 **MbK**, 74-75.
181 On this question, see my study: *Anaphora of Saint James and Jacob of Edessa* (forthcoming).
182 Attested by **MbK**, 85; **DbS**, 17:4, p 94-95; BM.add 14523 (= Connolly, *St James*, 103).
183 **MbK**: 'Before you, O Lord God'

second prayer of the imposition of hands, on which Bar Kepha comments:

> 'The priest prays, saying: "To you have your servants bowed their heads"—that is, he entreats God for them in this prayer that he will send upon them mercies and blessings, that with the purity which is befitting they may receive the holy and life-giving mysteries.'[184]

Then peace is greeted again, and the priest says the third benediction in the name of the Trinity:

> 'The grace and mercies of the Trinity, Holy, glorious, uncreated, self-existent, eternal, adorable and consubstantial, be with you all, my brethren, for ever.' (*People*: '**Amen**.')

The seven attributes of the Holy Trinity that the blessing contains, are attested since the ninth century. Bar Kepha knew four of them (holy, uncreated, eternal, consubstantial). However, a much simpler form ('The grace of the Trinity, holy and consubstantial, be with you all') was used at least until the eleventh century.[185] **GrJ** has a formula similar to that of Bar Kepha.[186] The third benediction is absent in **MC, AC, TD** and **JEGS**. As the first benediction introduces the celebration in a Trinitarian context, the third brings out the Trinitarian dimension of communion. Thus Bar Kepha writes:

'That is, he (the priest) says this to them: "These mysteries which have been consecrated and completed and perfected for you, and which you are about to receive, they have been bestowed upon you by the grace of the Holy Trinity, since they are not without or apart from the Trinity, but are of the Persons of the Trinity, that is the Son become incarnate".'[187]

S. HOLY THINGS TO THE HOLY

Following the benediction, incense is placed and the paten and the chalice are extolled.[188] The elevation or the exaltation of the mysteries has become a solemn rite.[189] As a prelude to the rite the deacon cries out: 'Be attentive with fear (*proskomen*).'[190] The people's response ('Lord, have mercy on us and help us') is absent in ancient manuscripts.[191] Then the priest cries out: 'Holy things to the

184 **MbK**, 86.

185 Connolly, *St James*, 104; **ATim**: **AS.I-I**, 44; Heiming, **AS.II-ii**, 174.

186 **GrJ**: 'And the grace and mercies of the Holy and consubstantial and uncreated and adorable Trinity shall be with you all.'

187 **MbK**, 86; cf **DbS**, 17:6, p 95.

188 'Extolling' involves both elevating the elements and describing certain movements with them. See note 192 below.

189 cf M Arranz, 'Le "Sancta Sanctis" dans la tradition liturgiques des églises' in *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 15(1973), 31-67

190 In ancient manuscripts, the Greek expression has been transliterated. Cf Heiming, AS.II-ii, 174; Connolly, St James, 104. The Creed is preceded by a similar exhortation: 'Sophia theou proskomen' ('Let us heed with fear to the wisdom of God').

191 Heiming, 174; Connolly, 104.

holy' and the people say: '**One Holy Father, one Holy Son and one Holy Spirit.**'[192] In modern printed texts, these have been expanded:

Priest: Holy things are given to the holy and to the pure.
People: **One Holy Father, One Holy Son, One Holy Spirit.**
Glory to the Father, and to the Son and to the (living) Holy Spirit, who are one, for ever and ever.

During the acclamation and the response, the priest raises the paten with both hands, kisses it and extols it three times. Then he places it on the *tablaito* (= *antimension*) and repeats the same action with the chalice.[193] Then he holds the paten in his right hand and the chalice in his left and holds them in the form of a cross, placing the right hand over the left, and cries out:

'The one Holy Father with us, who by his mercy created the world. (*People*: **Amen**).

'The one Holy Son with us, who, by his own precious sufferings, redeemed the world. (**Amen**). The one Holy Spirit with us, the perfecter and the fulfiller of all that has been and all that will be. May the name of the Lord be blessed for ever and ever.'

The text published by Heiming gives a rather simple form:

Priest: Holy things to the holy.
People: **One Holy Father *etc.***
Deacon: Bless me, O Lord.
Priest: May the name of the Lord be blessed and glorified in heaven and on earth, for ever and ever. **Amen.**

Bar Kepha also knew a similar order. But the people's response known to him was the same as today. The final acclamation ('May the name of the Lord . . .') was apparently absent in **MbK** and **DbS**.

Bar Kepha and Bar Salibi say that the priest 'elevates and extols' the mysteries.[194] But neither of them says that they are extolled in the form of a cross. There is no question that the mysteries are held in the form of a cross.

In **SyJ**, the exaltation of the mysteries consists of three elements:

(i) The acclamation: 'Holy things to the holy';
(ii) paten and chalice are raised separately and extolled in the form of a cross;
(iii) the acclamations by the priest, holding the paten and the chalice in his hands. These three elements had been introduced in three successive stages.

The acclamation 'Holy things to the holy' was originally an invitation to communion. It recalls the exhortation of St Paul: 'Let a man examine himself and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup' (1 Cor.11.28). The Didache contains a similar invitation: 'If anyone is holy, let him come! If anyone is not, let him repent! Maranatha!' (10:6).

192 See: **MbK**, 86-87; Heiming, 174; Rücker, 52..
193 In modern times, the rubrics direct the manner to extol: For the paten one circle (anticlockwise), one cross and one circle. For the chalice, one cross, one circle and one cross.
194 **MbK**, 86; **DbS**, 17:9, p 96.

MC gives the acclamation and the response similar to those of **SyJ** ('Holy things to holy men . . . one is Holy, one is the Lord, Jesus Christ' (**MC** V,19). However, **MC** (also **AC**) does not say that the mysteries were raised and extolled. Regarding the people's response, **AC** gives a rather long formula:

'And when all have said: "Amen" [195] the deacon shall say: 'Let us attend!' Then shall the bishop call out to the people: "The holy gifts of God for the holy people of God!" And the people shall reply: "One is holy, One is Lord, Jesus Christ, to the glory of the Father: blessed are you for ever: Amen. Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will among men: hosanna to the Son of David, blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. God is the Lord and has appeared to us: hosanna in the highest!".'[196]

Thus **MC, AC** and **JEGS** represent the first stage of the development. In **JEGS** we find:

> '"Again the holy things to the holy": that is, to the soul, body and the mind, which are sanctified by the three hypostases with water, blood and the spirit, and by the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. Man is the image of God by his threefold composition: soul corresponds to the Father, body corresponds to the incarnation of the Son, and the mind corresponds to the Holy Spirit. And in this was the image of God. Again as the priest divides the body, they say "the holy things". He who receives (it) unworthily is guilty for not discerning the body of the Lord. And again the holy things to all those who sanctify by three glorifications.'[197]

Here Jacob gives very important information that the fraction was done during the acclamation. But in **NCR**, attributed to Jacob, the fraction has been placed between the intercession and the Lord's Prayer.

JETh represents the second stage. In fact we find in it:

> 'After this (= the Trinitarian blessing) they (= the fathers) have handed down that the priest shall witness to the people, and instruct and say: "These holy things of the body and blood are given to the holy and pure, not to those who are unholy." He cries out by testifying this. He raises the mysteries and shows them to the whole people as a testimony. Immediately the people cry out and say: "One Holy Father *etc.*" Thus they partake in the mysteries.'[198]

Bar Kepha and Bar Salibi say that the priest 'raises and extols' the mysteries. But they do not say that the paten and the chalice are raised and extolled separately and in the form of a cross or circle as today. Bar Salibi's comments suggest that the paten and the chalice were raised together:

> 'Again the mysteries are elevated and extolled by the priest. Then he cries out: "Holy things . . .", symbolizing the ascension of our Lord to the

195 Amen comes as the conclusion of the *katholike* (fraction and the Lord's Prayer are absent in **AC**). **TD** is silent on the fraction, Lord's Prayer and acclamation.
196 **AC**.VIII,13.11-13.
197 Fol.182v-183r.
198 **DbS** 3:6, p 10.

heaven. And again (it symbolizes) that he was splendidly sanctified by the angelic powers. Again, elevating the paten and the chalice in the air indicates that our Lord was elevated in clouds and then he entered his glory.'[199]

Bar Salibi, who usually comments on every minute rite, does not say that the holy vessels were held in the form of a cross. Thus we can assume that in the second stage, the paten and the chalice were raised before the communion probably 'to show' (**JETh**) the people.

The document, *The signing of the cross*, attributed to Jacob of Edessa attests that, at least since the seventh century, the Syrian Orthodox Church directs to sign crosses over the mysteries during the institution, the epiclesis and the fraction. This might have inspired the holding of the holy vessels in the form of a cross during the elevation, a gesture that developed in the third stage.

In the third stage, the gestures became complex. The paten and the chalice were raised separately. The custom of extolling them in the form of a cross or circle, was introduced most probably after the fifteenth century. Prayers were re-arranged and new prayers were introduced to suit the new structure and gestures. Originally the people's response was a Christological acclamation: 'One is holy; one is the Lord Jesus Christ' (**MC,AC**). But later, it was given a Trinitarian interpretation (**JEGS**) (text quoted *supra*). Similar interpretations might have been influential in the development of the gestures and prayers referring to the Trinity.

The oldest known manuscript of **NCR** gives only one prayer as people's response.[200] Bar Kepha refers to two prayers ('One Holy Father . . . Glory to the Father . . .') and this was the order known to Bar Salibi.

The present three (last) acclamations ('The Father, . . . the Son . . . , and the Holy Spirit, with us . . .') were introduced after the twelfth century.

After the celebration and the threefold acclamations, the mysteries are covered, a rite already attested by Bar Kepha.[201]

199 *Ibid.* 17:9, p 96.

200 Heiming, **AS.II-ii**, 174.

201 **MbK**, 87. cf **DbS**.18:1, p 99. Obviously separate covers were used for the paten and the chalice. The series of hymns that follow the elevation, known as *Quqliun* (= a Cycle of prayers) are found in the *Ordo Communis* after the seventeenth century.

5.
Communion and Post-Communion

T. COMMUNION

We shall give an outline of the communion rites, which will be helpful to understand their development.

C1. The priest turns to the people, stretches forth his hands and says: 'My brethren and my beloved, pray for me.'

C2. The curtain is drawn.(attested by Bar Salibi). The priest kneels before the altar and prays silently: 'Make me worthy, O Lord to receive you . . .'

C3. (a). He ascends the altar-steps, takes the *Gmurto* (= consecrated particle) with the spoon and says: 'You, I hold, who uphold the borders of the world . . .'

(b). He receives the *Gmurto* saying: 'The atoning *Gmurto* . . . is given to me . . .'

C4. He fills from the spoon from the chalice and drinks it saying: 'By your living and life-giving blood which was poured on the cross . . .'

C5. Then he communicates the priests and the deacons in the sanctuary.

C6. The priest places the incense and the curtain is withdrawn.

C7. *Priest/Deacon*: Let us cry and say:

C8. *Deacon*: Worshipped and glorified is the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. Glory be to him for ever . . .

C9. The priest carrying the paten and the chalice turns to the people and says: 'From your atoning altar, may remission descend to your servants, O Son of God, who came for our salvation and will come again for our resurrection and the restoration of our kind, forever.'

C10. The priest steps forward and says: 'Stretch out, O Lord, your invisible hand and bless this assembly of your worshippers who are prepared to receive your precious body and blood for the remission of debts and for the forgiveness of sins, and for confidence in you, our Lord and our God forever.'

C11. He stretches out his hands and says: 'May the mercy of the great God, and our redeemer, Jesus Christ, be upon the bearers of these holy mysteries . . .'

C12. Hymns.

C13. The priest then communicates the people saying to each one: 'The atoning *Gmurto* of the body and blood of Christ our God is given to this faithful believer for the remission of debts, and for the forgiveness of sins in both worlds.'

C14. The priest, before returning to the altar, stretches out his hands and says: 'Glory to you (*thrice*) . . . our Lord and God forever. Our Lord Jesus Christ, let not your body, which we have eaten, and your atoning blood, which we have drunk, be unto us for judgment nor for condemnation, but for the life and redemption of all of us. And have mercy upon us.'

At least until the eleventh century, the communion was a simple rite, which followed the *Sancta Sanctis*. In Jerusalem Psalm 34.8 was chanted as an invitation to the communion (**MC**.V,20). In **AC**, this Psalm was chanted during the communion (VIII,13,16). Unlike Bar Kepha, Bar Salibi says that after the *Sancta Sanctis*, the deacon sings: 'By the resurrection of (Christ) the King' and 'Glorify the Lord in his sanctuary', followed by a prayer(?) 'We beseech you', during which the priest breaks the bread into small pieces.[202]

The Patriarch Rahmani cites a document 'older than the writings of Bar Kepha', which reported a procession with the consecrated elements, the priest carrying the paten and the deacon the chalice, with other deacons carrying censer, lights and fans.[203] Unfortunately Rahmani does not identify the document.

In a tenth century manuscript (BM.add 17128), we find a rather simple rite of communion:[204]

Priest: Holy things to the holy.
People: **One Holy Father . . .**
Deacon: Bless, O Lord.
Priest: May the name of the Lord . . .

Prayer when the mysteries go forth: Hold us worthy that we may eat your body and drink your blood and become heirs of your kingdom, O Son of God, who came for our redemption, for ever. **Amen**.

According to this manuscript, the holy mysteries were brought to the people, immediately after the *Sancta Sanctis*, which was in fact an invitation to communion. Normally, the celebrant carried the paten and the deacon the chalice (**AC**.VIII,13,15). At least until the ninth century, the holy body was given into the hand of the faithful. St Ephrem speaks of this custom: 'O Son of God, may the palm hands that were stretched out to receive the (divine) gifts from you, be not be restrained in the day of judgment.'[205] This custom is further attested by **MC**:

> 'In approaching therefore, come not with your wrists extended, or your fingers spread; but make your left hand a throne for the right, as for that which is to receive a king. And having hallowed your palm, receive the body of Christ, saying over it Amen. So then after having carefully hallowed your eyes by the touch of the holy body, partake of it.' (**MC**.V,21).

However, this was not a custom limited to Jerusalem. In his hymn 'On the priesthood' St Ephrem says that the believers embrace and kiss Christ as they receive communion:

> 'The angels in the heights astonish: how far the earthly being have reached (in their dignity). They (the angels) glorify and are silent without searching where he dwells. But the earthly beings, the sons of the dust, embrace and kiss him.'[206]

202 DbS 17:13, p 97
203 Rahmani, *Liturgies*, 435. I Sakka also speaks of a similar procession. see G Khouri-Sarkis in OS.XXI-2 (1967) 177-186 (note 26 to the article by J Cody).
204 Published by Connolly, *St James*, 104 (the *Sancta Sanctis*, quoted *supra*).
205 Quoted by Rahmani, *Liturgies*, 245
206 *Ibid*. 246

Most probably, Ephrem here refers to the custom of kissing the holy body, as it is received in the hands. In the ninth century, Bar Kepha comments on receiving communion in the hands:

> 'The right hand which is stretched out, while the left hand supports it, to receive the mysteries: That is, it is a sign of the preciousness of the gift which is received, which is an earnest of life immortal.'[207]

However, by the twelfth century, this practice seems to have been extinct. Thus Bar Salibi does not comment on the manner of receiving communion.

MC says that the believers say Amen, as they receive communion. But it was given probably without any formula of administration. But **AC** directs regarding the formula:

> 'The bishop shall give oblation, saying: "The body of Christ". And the one receiving shall say: "Amen". The deacon shall hold the cup, and when he gives it he shall say: "The blood of Christ, the cup of life". And the one drinking shall say: "Amen".' (VIII,13,15).

MbK and **DbS** are silent on the formula of administration. Generally, the ancient manuscripts do not contain the communion rites, probably because they were familiar to the celebrant. However, the commentaries (**MbK**, **DbS**, John of Dara) give the impression that communion was given in remarkable simplicity. Rites similar to those in **MC** must have continued for centuries.

The earliest document to give the prayers of the communion rite is BM add.17128 (quoted *supra*). Similar prayer is attested in Paris Syriac 70 (AD 1059): 'May the mercy of the great God and our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, be upon the bearers of these mysteries and upon those who receive them forever.'[208]

The general practice before the twelfth century was to give communion with a short prayer similar to the one quoted above. The paten and chalice were taken back to the altar to conclude the anaphora. During communion psalms or similar hymns were sung. From the thirteenth century onwards, manuscripts give detailed communion rites. Thus in BM.add 14691 (AD 1230) we find the following prayer:

'[After the *Sancta Sanctis*].

The prayer when the priest partakes (of the mysteries): "Make us worthy, O Lord, to receive you" (= C2).

The prayer when the priest and the deacons partake: "The atoning *Gmurto* of the body" (= C3-b).

Another when the mysteries go forth: "From your atoning altar" (= C9 + C11).

Prayer after communion: "We give thanks to you, O Lord" (= Thanksgiving prayer of **SyJ**).'

A formula of administration is still absent. It is attested in a fourteenth century manuscript, as part of the Anaphora of Mar Eusthathius.[209] In BM.add17269

207 **MbK**, 88.
208 Paris Syriac 70, fol.14. Expanded in C11
209 BM.add.14693 (fourteenth century)

(fifteenth century), the communion rite is preceded by the seeking of pardon (= C1). The rubrics of this *ordo* direct that the priest should hold the paten in his right hand and the chalice in his right and that he should turn from the left side towards the people and right side towards the altar. Occasionally manuscripts give the *incipit* of the hymns to be sung. None of the pre-sixteenth century manuscripts that I consulted directs that the priest should kneel before the altar and that the curtain is drawn. The deacon's acclamation (= C8) is also attested since the sixteenth century (eg.Vatican Syriac 68—AD 1567).

V. THE THANKSGIVING PRAYER

After having given communion, the priest returns to the altar and places the paten and chalice on it. Then he says the thanksgiving prayer which begins:

'We give thanks to you'.

Until the sixteenth century, the manuscripts attest that the thanksgiving prayer was preceded by the deacon's exhortation: 'Let us stand well'. As a response to it, the people said: 'We give thanks to you...' With the same words, the priest began the thanksgiving prayer. Vatican Syriac 68 (AD 1567) gives the complete text of the deacon's exhortation and the people's response: (*Fol.*235v-248r):

> '[After communion]. *Deacon*: Let us stand well. After having eaten and drunk and participated in the holy, divine, mystical and life-giving mysteries of the precious body and blood of our Lord Christ, who has given and made us worthy of this ineffable, incomparable life-giving gift, which quickens those who receive, let us offer thanksgiving. We give thanks to you, Lord our God; increasingly we give thanks to you now.'

[The priest then prays the prayer of thanksgiving addressed to the Son, *Hutomo* and the dismissal].

This is the only manuscript known to me with the complete text of the deacon's exhortation. Most manuscripts give the *incipit*: 'Let us stand well', followed by the people's response: 'We give thanks'. The exhortation and the response were known to Bar Kepha.[210] In the twelfth century, Bar Salibi comments on the deacon's exhortation but not on the people's response.[211] This response did not disappear completely, but was added to the priest's thanksgiving prayer.

We do not know when and how the deacon's exhortation disappeared. As it is absent in a number of manuscripts, we can assume that it was a custom limited to some places. In the text used by the priest, the *Ordo Communis* is normally not included. In some cases only the *incipit* is given. This might be the reason for the disappearance of some prayers (the deacon's exhortation, for example) in the course of time.

210 MbK, 88.
211 DbS.19:1-2. p 100

The thanksgiving prayer is followed by a greeting of peace, which is absent in **MbK, DbS** and in ancient manuscripts. It may have been introduced after the twelfth century, as a prelude to the last prayer of the imposition of hands.

After the pax, the deacon exhorts : 'Having received these holy mysteries that have been administered, let us again bow down our heads unto the merciful Lord.' **MbK** gives a simple formula: 'Before the Lord let us bow our heads', which continued to be used as late as the twelfth century.[212]

The deacon's exhortation and the prayer of the imposition of hands are not attested in **MC** and **GrJ**. But **AC** gives both of them: 'Bow down before God through his Christ and receive the blessing' (**AC**. VIII,15,6). According to **JETh**, the prayer of the imposition of hands is among the traditions that have been handed down by the 'fathers of Nicea':

> 'It has been prescribed that after the reception (of the mysteries) there shall be confession and thanksgiving for being worthy of the communion in the body and blood, and there shall be again the prayer of the imposition of hand and the deacon shall dismiss them in tranquillity. This tradition I have received from the fathers: thus, do I also transmit it (to you).'[213]

The Last Prayer: The prayer of the imposition of the hands, which is the last prayer of the anaphora, is addressed to the Son. Bar Kepha explains the theological basis of this prayer:

> 'Wherefore . . . All the prayers of the *qurobo* are addressed to the Father, except this prayer, the last of all the prayers, which is addressed to the Son, wherein the priest confesses to the Son, because that through him we have gained access to the Father, and he is the way that leads us, and the door that brings us in to the Father, according to his own unimpeachable and all-holy words.'[214]

W. DISMISSAL

The anaphora concludes with the dismissal. From **AC** we know that the deacon dismissed the people saying, 'Depart in peace!' (VIII,15,10). In the twelfth century, in the Maphrianate, it was still the privilege of the deacon to dismiss the people, a custom attested also in **GrJ** and **JETh**. But in the Patriarchate, the priest himself gave the dismissal. Gradually, the 'Western' custom was accepted in the 'East' as well. Bar Salibi writes on both customs:

> 'According to the eastern custom, at the end of the *qûrôbô*, the deacon says: *Barek mor*: "Go in peace". That is, he directs the people to leave in tranquillity and peace. The people say: "In the name of the Lord, our God . . .", that is, as you have ordered us, we are leaving in the name of the Lord Almighty. (But) in the West, these are not said, except *Barek mor*

212 **MbK**, 89; cf **DbS**, 19:3, p 100
213 **DbS** 3:6, p 10
214 **MbK**, 90; **DbS**, 19:5, p 101. In **AC** the last prayer is addressed to the Father (VIII,15,7).

that the deacon says. The priest says: "Bless us all; protect us all, *etc*", and immediately the people sing the stanzas, the priest turns towards the people and signs three crosses saying: "We entrust you to grace", that is, I entrust you to the Holy Trinity, who is God existing in three hypostases, which will protect you in your ways, and us with you, by his mercies.'[215]

According to Bar Salibi, in the East, the deacon's dismissal was followed by the people's response: 'In the name of...'. But in the West, the deacon simply said *Barek mor* (= Bless my Lord!) and the priest chanted a *hutomo* (= concluding prayer or hymn), followed by a similar hymn by the people. Then the priest turned towards the people and said the formula of dismissal. The present practice corresponds to the 'Western' custom.

X. POST-COMMUNION

After the dismissal, the curtain is drawn across the door of the sanctuary, and the priest continues the post-communion rites. **AC** speaks of the distribution of the *eulogia* (blessed bread: **AC**.VIII,31,2). Since **MbK** and **DbS** are silent on the post-communion, we can assume that it was still a simple rite. The present post-communion is attested in the manuscripts written in fifteenth century or later.

215 **DbS** 19:9, p 103.